

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. XIII

MAY, 1942

No. 5

Leading Thoughts on Eschatology in the Epistles to the Thessalonians

III

In our discussion of the leading eschatological thoughts of the Epistles to the Thessalonians we first of all called attention to the teaching of St. Paul that the Lord will return, and will return suddenly, as a thief in the night, 1 Thess. 5:1-3; in the second installment we pointed out that He will return only after the great Antichrist will have been revealed, 2 Thess. 2:1-12. The discussion of this second division has not been completed. After warning his readers not to let themselves be misled into believing that the Day of the Lord had already arrived and after giving a description of the Antichrist who was to come, vv. 1-4, the apostle continues: "*Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?*" v. 5. This reminder and question contains a mild rebuke for the Thessalonians. Since Paul had told them of these things while he was present with them and told them more than once (note the past tense in the original, ἔλεγεν), they should not have permitted themselves to be misled. Without particularly stressing his reminder, he then continues: "*And now ye know what withholdeth [restraineth] that he might be revealed in his time,*" v. 6. Paul expresses himself very briefly, but the meaning of his words is clear. He wants to say: The Day of the Lord has not yet appeared, for the Antichrist has not yet been revealed; and the man of sin, whom I have just portrayed, will be recognized only after he has been revealed; but that which withholds him and keeps him from being revealed you know now already, νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε. "Now ye know." The grammatical construction demands this connection of "now." The translation "that which now withholds" would require a different construction, either τὸ νῦν κατέχον or τὸ κατέχον νῦν. The Thessalonians knew that there still existed

an agency delaying the appearance of the Antichrist, retarding his manifestation, preventing him from boldly rearing his head. The Thessalonians also knew the nature of this agency. Evidently Paul had previously enlightened them on that matter; hence it was not necessary at this time to enlarge upon it. For that reason he does not repeat what he has already told them but speaks merely of "what withholdeth," τὸ κατέχον, and later, v. 7, of him "who now letteth," ὁ κατέχων. Paul does not name the agency, and therefore we must study these two words and the entire context very carefully in order to learn just what or whom the apostle had in mind when he used these expressions. Etymologically there can be no doubt concerning the meaning of the words. They denote "that which" or "one who suppresses or holds back," τὸ κωλύον, as Chrysostom circumscribes the word. This certainly does not mean "that which prevents me from expressing myself freely," as some foolish interpreters have thought. That would militate against the context, since Paul actually does express himself freely and since he knew not the fear of man. Nor can the meaning be "that which prevents the *parousia* of Christ," as others have explained the term. That likewise would militate against the context; for in this verse not the return of Christ is being discussed, but the manifestation of the Antichrist. Another important fact must not be overlooked, that the word never denotes to keep back something coming from without, but to prevent or retard the free and full development of some plan or idea originating within one's self or carried in one's mind. Cp. Rom. 1:18; Luke 4:42. (The people sought to stop Jesus from carrying out his plan stated in v. 43.) This interpretation of the terms is demanded also by the clause of purpose which follows: "That he might be revealed in his time." The appearance of the Antichrist (for with "he" no one else than the Antichrist can be meant, in view of the context) is being held back by some force which is known to the Thessalonians and retarded for a purpose, "that he might be revealed in his time." His appearance shall not be a matter of chance nor a matter of his own choice, but he shall appear at such a time as God shall set, a time assigned and permitted to him by God, not earlier, not now already, but "in his time." What is meant by this force we shall see later when we discuss the concept Antichrist. But we can already establish the fact that the same force is meant as referred to in v. 7, "he who letteth." The neuter, τὸ κατέχον, stresses the principle, the force, the masculine ὁ κατέχων, on the other hand, emphasizes the person, one who will direct that force. We shall see that most probably τὸ κατέχον is the Roman Empire in its entire organization; ὁ κατέχων is the ruler of that empire, the Caesar. Finally it is to be noted that here again the Antichrist is placed parallel with Christ by the

use of the term "revealed," as in vv. 3 and 8. (Cp. also chap. 1:7.) As Christ came at His time, in the fullness of time, Gal. 4:4, and as Christ will come again in the time designated by the Father, Acts 1:7; 17:31, so also the caricature of Christ, the Antichrist, will appear at his appointed time (note the word *καί* and the remarks in the March issue of this journal, page 189). If Luther's works are at hand, it will be interesting to compare his "Passional Christi und Antichristi," St. Louis Edition, XIV:198.—Still in the same vein Paul continues: "*The mystery of iniquity doth already work, only [it remains a secret] until [that is, the only thing that must first come to pass] he who now letteth will be taken out of the way.*" V. 7. The apostle now explains more fully the unusual expression in v. 6, that the Antichrist will be revealed "in his time." Indeed, he is active already now, but in secret; he can come out in the open only after that force which now holds him back is put aside. The apostle, however, does not say: "The Antichrist doth work," but very significantly: "The mystery of iniquity is active." All emphasis rests on the word "mystery"; in the Greek text it is placed at the beginning and separated from the word which modifies it, iniquity. What is to be emphasized is that the iniquity as yet does its work only in secret since it is still being suppressed. The "mystery" of sin described in the foregoing is *already* present; more than that, it is already active and working vigorously, effectively, (*ἐνεργεῖται*, "doth already work," is stronger than Luther's translation, "es reget sich schon") but it has not yet been revealed; it is still in hiding and keeps under cover: it is a "mystery." But it is a mystery of "iniquity," a mystery consisting of godlessness, or possessing godlessness. Iniquity, *ἀνομία*, means literally "lawlessness," 1 John 3:4, which includes godlessness, breaking all divine commandments and bowing to no one's will. Already Daniel had thus portrayed the Antichrist: "The king shall do according to his will," Dan. 11:36. The word "iniquity" corresponds to the term "falling away," v. 3. There the falling away reaches its climax in the man of sin; here the iniquity reaches its climax in "that Wicked" one, v. 8. Here again the Antichrist is placed parallel with Christ. As there is a mystery of "godliness," 1 Tim. 3:16, so there is also a mystery of godlessness. As there are "deep things of God," 1 Cor. 2:10, so there are also "depths of Satan," Rev. 2:24. But this mystery will become exposed, the godlessness will be revealed, the "Wicked" one will come to the light and will be plainly recognized as soon as he "who now letteth" will "be taken out of the way." That is stated in the second part of the verse in language somewhat pregnant but very clear. The *κατέχων*, "he who now letteth," (as already noted) must be essentially the same agency referred to in v. 6 by the term *τὸ κατέχων*,

"what withholdeth." The same action is predicated of both terms: both hold back the manifestation of the Antichrist. This restraining force must, therefore, have been so constituted that it could be spoken of as a person and at the same time as a thing. That again points to the Roman Empire and its ruler, as we shall explain more fully later. At the time Paul is writing these words, "He who letteth" hinders the appearance of the Antichrist; but in time he will be removed, he will be taken out of the way. In what manner this removal is to take place is not indicated; the expression simply indicates some kind of removal, not of necessity a removal by violence or death. Cp. 1 Cor. 5:3; Col. 2:14.

The portrayal of Antichrist as sketched briefly by St. Paul puts one fact beyond the possibility of refutation: At the time this letter was being written the "mystery" was already on the way, in fact, already in existence and active; only it had not yet become manifest, and its activity was on a small scale. It was still a mystery, known to the apostle but recognizable, it seems, to only a few beside him. This declaration, therefore, shows that the Antichrist cannot be a specific individual, that the term is used ideally, collectively, comprising a series of individuals, all of them collectively forming the complete concept "Antichrist." This individual is to remain until the return of Christ, v. 8, which would be impossible if some individual living and already active in the days of Paul were meant, as history and common sense demonstrate. Either the Antichrist was then already on the way or—Paul was thoroughly and completely mistaken in this matter, and that cannot be since he wrote as the mouthpiece of God.

Paul continues: "*And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming,*" v. 8. What was already hinted at in the foregoing is now stated in clear and unmistakable language: The Antichrist will come to light *then*, when "he who letteth" will have been removed. He will then really become manifest, the mystery which hitherto has remained concealed will be unveiled. A new name is given to the Antichrist, "that Wicked," ὁ ἄνομος, the lawless, the ruthless one. (Luther: "Der Boshafte.") This designation is occasioned by the expression used in the previous verse: "The mystery of iniquity," of lawlessness, "doth already work." When revealed, the godlessness will appear in full growth, in one head, in one person, in the Antichrist. The entire context clearly proves that none other than the man of sin and the son of perdition is meant with "that Wicked" one. He is indeed a lawless one because he sets aside the Law of God, he does away with divine authority and establishes an autocracy, a dictatorship, in the fullest sense of the term. He is not

an atheist, not an anarchist, but an Antichrist, as Daniel has prophesied: "The king shall do according to his will," Dan. 11:36. While Christ as the righteous servant of the Lord was obedient to the will of His Father unto death, so His opposite sets aside the divine will, stands there as a lawless one, a revolutionist who makes himself God; he is not a pseudo-Christ, a false Christ, but an Antichrist.

Before Paul proceeds to describe the activity of the ruthless one, vv. 9, 10, he points out in v. 8 b the ultimate fate of the Antichrist. In order to comfort the believers, he assures them that this fear-inspiring enemy of Christ and His Church will in due time be judged and condemned. In like manner the apostle had in v. 3 first called attention to the fate of the "man of sin" by adding at once the term "son of perdition," one bound to perish eternally, and only then he had proceeded in v. 4 to outline his activity.—Paul says, "The Lord shall consume [him] with the spirit of His mouth and shall destroy [him] with the brightness of His coming." In the style of the Old Testament prophets Paul foretells in vigorous, glowing language in a well-balanced parallelism the fate of the foe of Christendom. In fact, the first member of the parallelism is a quotation from a prophecy recorded Is. 11:4: "With the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked." "The wicked" does not refer to the ungodly in general, the singular is to designate the one great archenemy of God and Christ so frequently referred to by the prophets and in the Psalms, the Antichrist.

But what is meant by the spirit, the breath, τὸ πνεῦμα, of His mouth, wherewith Christ will consume the Antichrist? Ordinarily this expression is referred to the might and irresistible power of Christ. In order to slay the Antichrist, the Lord does not even have to utter a word, much less move His hand. "That which in the case of man is the weakest," says Hofmann in commenting on this passage, "the breath of the mouth, is in the case of Jesus sufficient to consume the adversary," when He will come in His glory. ("Die Heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhaengend untersucht." I:334.) The Old Testament, however, suggests a different and more suitable interpretation. The breath of the mouth of Christ is His Word according to Is. 34:16, the breath being thought of as the bearer of the word. By means of His Word Christ will remove the Antichrist, will consume him. And finally He will put an end to his reign "with the brightness of His coming." At His coming Christ will do away with him, overthrow him, annihilate him, destroy him, will "cast him into a lake of fire burning with brimstone," as the Book of Revelation tells us, Rev. 19:20. Very solemnly Paul writes: "With the brightness of His coming." In the New Testament these two expressions designate exclusively the

return of Christ, Titus 2:13; 2 Tim. 4:8 (ἐπιφάνεια, manifestation, παρουσία, return, presence, advent). Here the expressions are combined, and the combination emphasizes more forcefully that the *parousia* will be a visible one and a return coupled with brightness and glory. That will be the fate, the end of the Antichrist, eternal damnation. That, too, had been foretold by Daniel, when chap. 9, v. 26, he wrote concerning the coming prince: "The end thereof shall be with a flood," in the deluge, in the universal judgment of the world, and v. 27: "That determined shall be poured upon the desolate."

"Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Vv. 9, 10. These verses in particular show clearly the glaring contrast between Antichrist and Christ, so often pointed out by Paul in these two letters. The One is Christ, the other Anti-christ. To both, indeed, a coming, a *parousia*, is frequently ascribed. But Antichrist's *parousia* shall precede that of the Lord, vv. 3, 8, and shall come to an end through the very return of Christ. The manner in which the "Wicked" one will become established explains why he will have such a great following and be capable of bringing about such extensive falling away. His coming "is after the work of Satan," comes about through the activity of Satan. While the heavenly Father "bringeth in the first-begotten into the world," Heb. 1:6; 10:5, it is Satan who causes the "Wicked" one to arise; of course, with divine permission, Rev. 13:15. And since the coming of the Antichrist is the work of Satan, it is accompanied by all manner of "signs and lying wonders." The expressions are multiplied in order to give a vivid description of the matter: "power," "signs," "lying wonders." The terms differ slightly in their meaning. "Power," δύναμις, describes the signs according to their source, the power producing them; "signs," σημεῖα, designates the "miracles" according to their significance; they indicate and reveal the importance and authority of him who performs them; and "wonders," τέρατα, describes the signs with reference to their effect upon others; they arouse amazement, fear, and trembling. Scripture uses these terms frequently in connection with the works of Christ and the apostles. Peter calls Jesus "a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs," Acts 2:22, and according to Heb. 2:4 God corroborated the preaching of the apostles "with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles." Cp. also 2 Cor. 12:12. Paul describes the caricature of Christ's miracles. Satan gives unto the Antichrist and unto his apostles power to perform signs and wonders, even as the Father has given Christ the authority to perform

miracles, and as Christ in turn has granted this power to his disciples. In Antichrist we find the fulfillment of the word of Christ in His eschatological discourse: "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders," Matt. 24:24, as also the Book of Revelation tells us that the dragon gave great power unto the seven-headed beast, that "he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do," Rev. 13:2, 13, 14. Yet there is a vast difference between the miracles of Christ and those of the Antichrist. Christ's miracles were true miracles, miracles of truth, as He Himself is the truth. The miracles of the Antichrist, on the other hand, are "lying signs and wonders." The apostle does not mean to say that all miracles of the "Wicked" one are lying deceptions without reality, fraudulent mystifications, coarse swindles, trickery and hocus-pocus, or the result of illusions and hallucinations. That may be true in innumerable cases, yet it cannot be denied, and the apostle does not mean to dispute the fact, that many of the strange feats performed can neither be classed as outright frauds nor be explained according to the known laws of nature. Yet, even granted that many of Antichrist's miracles are inexplicable, are supernatural, they are nevertheless lying signs and wonders. The Antichrist boasts that they are divine miracles, performed by divine power, proving him to be the divinely appointed ruler of the Church; while in truth he does not perform one miracle by the authority and in the power of God, but by the satanic power of the Prince of Darkness. "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light," and his tool, the Antichrist, "as a minister of righteousness," 2 Cor. 11:14, 15. They proceed from falsehood, are saturated with falsehood, and produce falsehood, since they deceive and mislead men into misbelief, as we shall see from vv. 10-12. It cannot be otherwise. The devil is the father of lies, and when he speaks and works lies, he speaks and works his own. Lying is essential to his being.

Finally, the coming of the Antichrist will be "with all deceitfulness of unrighteousness." The activities of the Antichrist have the appearance of righteousness; nevertheless they are full of unrighteousness and therefore deceive the people. Since deception, lying, and trickery are some of the characteristic marks of unrighteousness and wickedness, he, the "Wicked" one, makes full use of these foul means in order to rob men of their salvation. Fortunately, this power does not extend over all people; the frightful activity of the Antichrist is not irresistible; only they "that perish" become its victims, only they who ultimately go to eternal perdition. Their terrible fate is self-invited. The reason the "Wicked" one is

able to seduce them by his satanic activities and arts and trickeries is that "they receive not the love of the truth." They have well deserved their fate. It is visited upon them as a reward, ἀντὶ ὧν, because. Note that Paul does not say: they did not receive the truth, but rather, they did not receive the *love* of the truth. In the former case it would be conceivable that they had esteemed the truth, but because of some fatal deception had not come to a living knowledge of the truth and therefore had not accepted it. But no, they did not receive the *love* of the truth; they did not even have the desire for the truth; they hardened themselves against it. They did not want to know anything of the truth of Christianity (for that is the meaning of "truth"). They did not want to know the Gospel, they did not want to hear of the love of God in Christ Jesus offered to them in the Gospel. And this their guilt appears all the greater when we remember the purpose for which the truth was offered to them, the marvelous blessing it had in store for them. This truth was to rescue and save them also. God's intention and objective was their everlasting salvation. With careless indifference they neglected the great salvation prepared for them, and as a punishment for their neglect they fall victims to the wiles of Antichrist. Continuing in the same line of thought, the apostle now concludes with the words of warning: *"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness,"* vv. 11, 12. Therefore, because those who perish did not receive the love of the truth, God sends them a "strong delusion." Literally the meaning is: he sends them a power or working of error. The error is already at hand, but at the time of the Antichrist, when sin and deception will manifest their full force in the man of sin, the error will do its deadly work. And let us not forget, God will send these strong delusions. We cannot get away from this meaning of the word; we must accept it in its full significance, we dare not weaken it, as some commentators have done, by understanding it to mean that all this comes to people by divine sufferance. The text does not say that God permits error to come, but it says that He sends it. Yes, He punishes the wicked by means of the wicked. Deliberate and persistent contempt for the truth brings with it divine punishment in the form of strong delusions sent by God, Rom. 1:24; 2 Sam. 24:1; Job 12:16; Prov. 1:29-31. God does that in order that they who do not wish to believe the truth will believe a lie. That is God's intention in carrying out His righteous judgment. He punishes sin by means of greater sin. They shall believe a lie, τῷ ψεύδει, not merely error, τῇ πλάνῃ, but a lie, a falsehood, consciously and purposely spoken in enmity of God. Lying

is the direct opposite of truth; and, if truth, the whole, complete Christian truth, is the truth of the Gospel, as we have seen, then "the lie" is not merely some single lie, but the whole and complete power of satanic perversion of all truth. It is the anti-Gospel, corresponding to him who is the father of lies and whose tool and prophet is the Antichrist.

All this will come to pass at God's direction for the ultimate purpose that "they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." That is God's ultimate intention when He sends "strong delusion." God has decreed a final decision, a mighty, terrible judgment. In that judgment all who have not believed the truth of Christianity "will be damned," all without exception. The translation of the Authorized Version, "they will be damned," says exactly what the apostle meant to express with the word κρίνεσθαι, which here, as frequently, is used in the sense of κατακρίνεσθαι. (Heb. 13:4.) The cause of their damnation is their unbelief. He that believes not will be damned. They had no love for the truth. The reason they did not love the truth was that it demanded righteousness of them. Instead, they had pleasure in unrighteousness, in godlessness, in the "lie." And for that reason they will finally be overtaken by the judgment that will be visited upon unrighteousness, upon the lie, upon unbelief.

This entire conclusion is an urgent warning addressed to the Thessalonians and to all readers of all places and all times. It brings to mind the warning with which Jesus closed His conversation with Nicodemus, John 3:19, 20: "And this is the condemnation that light is come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." What the apostle here teaches by divine inspiration does not furnish Biblical basis for the error of Calvinism, but forms the foundation for the correct Lutheran distinction between the antecedent and the consequent will of God. The antecedent will of God is a merciful will, according to which He wants all men to be saved, 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Pet. 3:9; John 3:17. God is ready to condemn only after man refuses to believe, Is. 6:9, 10; Acts 28:24-27; Luke 8:10; John 3:18; 12:35-40. (Cp. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, 558; and II, 38-41.) For that reason Paul very definitely declares not that God sends the "delusion" but that He sends the power, the ability, and energy to produce delusion.

L. FUEBRINGER

Luther: A Blessing to the English

V. The First English Lutherans and the First English Lutheran Theological Seminary

"Martin Luther" is written over the page with the names of Gardiner, Cranmer, Thirlby, and Bilney, the degree list of Cambridge in 1521.

A committee was sent to London to have Luther's books examined and to get an order from Cardinal Wolsey to burn them — Drs. Humfrey; Robert Ridley, uncle of the martyr; John Watson, praised by Erasmus; and Henry Bullock, a pupil of Erasmus, "most learned Bovillus," now professor of Greek and vice-chancellor.

The books were burned on Market Hill about the Easter term, and the grand spectacle was graced by the august presence of the magnificent cardinal, Chancellor John Fisher of Rochester, and Vice-chancellor Bullock. Can we not see gown and town assisting at this act of faith?

Proctors John Denne and William Medew	
Paid Peter the bedel sent to the Lord Cardinal and the Chancellor with letters respecting Luther's works ..	20s.
For writing the statutes sent to the Lord Cardinal	12½d.
Paid Dr. Bulloke for expenses to London concerning the examination of Luther at the command of the Lord Cardinal	53s. 4d.
To Dr. Umphrey for his expenses in the like business	53s. 4d.
To Drs. Watson and Ridley	£5 6s. 8d.
To Dr. Nyocalas, deputy Vicechancellor, for drink and other expenses about the burning of the books of Martin Luther	2s.
[Peter the bedel is the father of Sir John Cheke, the great Greek scholar]	

What good did that burning do? Erasmus grinned: "By burning you can remove Luther's books from the shelves, but whether you can thereby remove them from men's hearts, I know not." By the way, how did Luther's books get to Cambridge? So far no one has been able to answer our question, but we think we have stumbled upon a clue. John Siberch, or Siburg, a German printer, the first to use Greek letters in England, settled in Cambridge in 1521. Next! At Christmas, 1525, Erasmus asked Robert Aldrige to greet John Siburg "the bookseller." Have we found the missing link?

Thomas Forman, or Farman, fellow and later president of Queens' College, where Erasmus had lived and taught, smuggled Luther's books into his college and hid them from the inquisitors, and they found eager readers.

Thomas Bilney wrote Bishop Tunstal: "There are those physicians upon whom that woman which was twelve years vexed had consumed all that she had and felt no help but was still worse and worse until such time as at the last she came unto Christ, and after she had once touched the hem of his garment through faith, she was so healed that presently she felt the same in her body. Oh, mighty power of the Most Highest! which I also, miserable sinner, have often tasted and felt. Who before that I could come unto Christ, had even likewise spent all that I had upon those ignorant physicians, that is to say, unlearned hearers of confession, so that there was but small force of strength left in me, which of nature was but weak, small store of money, and very little knowledge or understanding; for they appointed me fastings, watchings, buying of pardons, and masses: in all which things, as I now understand, they sought rather their own gain than the salvation of my sick and perishing soul." He heard two friends whisper about a new book, the Greek New Testament. He stole into the house where the forbidden book was secretly sold and got a copy. "He was soon known as a student and admirer of the writings of Luther." As Luther had been converted by Rom. 1:16, 17, so Bilney was converted by 1 Tim. 1:15. "Immediately I felt a marvellous comfort and quietness, insomuch as my bruised bones leapt for joy." Cooper, the old historian of Cambridge, says the reading of the New Testament "and the works of Luther taught him other views of religion." John Fox says Bilney was "the first framer of the University in the knowledge of Christ." Sir Thomas More calls him "a thorough Lutheran." If he is right, Bilney was the first English Lutheran.

The Lutheran faith produced a Lutheran life. John Fox "with surpassing beauty" describes him "preaching at the lazar cots, wrapping them in sheets, helping them of what they wanted, if they would convert to Christ; laborious and painful to the desperates; a preacher to the prisoners and comfortless; a great doer in Cambridge."

Thomas Thirlby had a room below Bilney's, and when he played on "the recorder," Bilney betook himself to prayer, as if to resist the Evil One. He disliked music as much as Andrew Fair-service hated the "kists of whustles." Bilney believed; therefore he spoke. He converted others.

William Paget read and spread Luther's works and lectured on the *Rhetoric* of Melancthon. He will visit Luther in August, 1532, on the "king's business" and become the powerful Lord Paget.

John Thixtill was "a warm supporter of the Reformation," and his retainer Remige will visit Luther and tell him of the progress of the Reformation in England.

Richard Smith will become a Doctor of the Canon Law and go to prison for heresy.

John Frith will be burned for heresy.

Simon Heynes will baptize Edward VI and oppose the savage Six Articles in 1539.

Nicholas Shaxton "boldly advocated Lutheran doctrines," and he will oppose the Six Articles.

Richard Taverner will translate Lutheran works and the New Testament and preach, though a lawyer.

Matthew Parker will become the famous archbishop of Canterbury under Elizabeth.

John Rogers will become pastor near Wittenberg, get out Matthew's Bible, be an able preacher and the first martyr under Bloody Mary.

Thomas Forman will become rector of Allhallows in Honey Lane, a D.D. in 1524, go to prison, and die in 1528.

Edward Crome, already D.D., will suffer in prison for years and die there.

John Skip will be "a warm friend of the Reformers" and almoner to Queen Anne.

John Mallory was another "early Lutheran."

William Warner was a "Gospeller," that is, he lectured on the Bible instead of the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard.

Simon Smith, "an early Lutheran," will become curate of Thomas Patmore, marry, and be punished.

Bilney converted Thomas Arthur, and the two converted John Nichols, or Lambert, who will be burned.

Hugh Latimer preached "An Examination of the Theological Opinions of Melanchthon." Bilney hastened to Latimer's room and begged him "for God's sake to hear my confession." What was the result?

"I was as obstinate a papist as any was in England, insomuch that when I should be made a Bachelor of Divinity, my whole oration was against Philip Melanchthon and against his opinions. Then having met Master Bilney, or rather St. Bilney, that suffered death for Christ's sake, I learned more by his confession than before in many years, so that from that time forward I began to smell the word of God and forsook the school doctors and such fooleries," said Bishop Latimer in his first sermon on the "Lord's Prayer."

Bishop West of Ely, the ordinary of Cambridge, asked Latimer "that you will preach me one sermon against Martin Luther and his doctrine."

"My lord . . . we are not permitted here to read his works. . . . If Luther do none otherwise than I have done, preaches no man's

doctrine, but only the doctrine of God out of the Scriptures, there needeth no confutation of his doctrine."

Bilney was forbidden to preach "Luther's doctrines." "I will not preach Luther's doctrines, if there are any peculiar to him, but I must preach the doctrine of Jesus Christ, although Luther should preach it too."

Robert Barnes became an Augustinian friar in 1514, and, being a lad of parts, was sent to the University of Louvain, a rival of Paris. On his return with his pupil Thomas Paynell he was made prior. "Putting aside Duns and Dorbel," scholasticism and Byzantine logic, he lectured on Terence, Plautus, Cicero, and the letters of St. Paul, and "caused the house shortly to flourish with good letters, and made a great part of the house learned who before were drowned in barbarous ignorance." He was "lucid and effective and had no equal." He was helped by Thomas Paynell, who will be sent on important embassies to the Lutheran princes.

All of these were accounted converts of Bilney.

Then there was William Tyndale, who will register at Wittenberg on May 27, 1524, as Guillelmus Daltici ex Anglia and translate the New Testament.

William Roy will register on June 10, 1525, as Guilhelmus Roy ex Londino and help Tyndale get out "Luther's New Testament in English."

Thomas Dugate will go to Luther for advice and be advised to marry if he cannot contain. He will do so, call himself Benet, and be burned for a Protestant.

Edward Fox will be at Wittenberg from January 1, 1536, till April and be an influential Lutheran.

Nicholas Heath will be with Fox at Wittenberg and become a violent persecutor of the Lutherans.

Stephen Gardiner will be a very bloody persecutor of the Lutherans; a Doctor of the Canon Law in 1524.

Nicholas Ridley will be burned with Latimer.

Thomas Thirlby will be the first and the last bishop of Windsor.

Richard Sampson will become bishop of Chichester.

Miles Coverdale will get out the first complete English Bible and the first English hymnal, translated from Luther and other Lutherans.

Simon Matthew will preach against the Pope.

Rodolph Bradford will go to prison for spreading the English New Testament.

John Taylor will go to prison for attacking the savage Six Articles.

Thomas Swinerton "embraced the doctrines of Luther" and fled under Bloody Mary.

Robert Ferrar will buy Lutheran books and be burned.

John Ponet, or Poynt, will become a Lutheran, an able preacher, bishop of Rochester, flee to Strassburg under Mary, and defend Luther against lies.

Richard Bayfield, a priest, converted by Barnes, in prison for nine months, freed by Barnes, will flee to the continent, import Protestant books, burned in 1531.

Thomas Allen, son of the Lord Mayor, will comfort Saint Bilney at his fiery death.

John Bale will send to England the account of Luther's death and call him "a saint" and become bishop of Ossory.

Nicholas Drumm will go to prison for being a Lutheran.

John Rickes will translate Otto Brunsfelsing's "Pronosticacion" for 1536.

Robert Aldrich, who was with Erasmus in his famous pilgrimage to Our Lady of Walsingham in 1511.

"Richard Croke is the great man at Leipzig," wrote Erasmus, and taught Greek to Camerarius and Mosellanus about 1514 for fifteen guilders a year. He went to Dresden and returned to Cambridge in 1517 and became an A. M.

Peter Valence, a Norman, "who held Lutheran opinions" and attacked Pope Leo's indulgence, will comfort the heretics William Wolsey and Robert Pygot in 1555.

John Stokys will promise Cromwell to reform and preach sincerely God's Word.

John Leland will become famous as a linguist, orator, poet, and historian.

William Butts will be knighted, the physician of King Henry, and yet belong to the "Lutheran party."

John Clarke will go to Oxford and die in prison for Lutheranism.

George Joy will be persecuted for heresy and flee to Strassburg.

George Constantine will be jailed for his Protestant opinions and spreading Protestant books.

John Fryer will go to prison for his Lutheran opinions.

Richard Harman will go to prison for heresy.

Sygar Nicholson will go to prison for his Lutheran opinions and Lutheran books. The cost "For faggots for burning books, 4d."

Others were John Bradford and George Day.

Thomas Cranmer came "to be nursed in the grossest kind of sophistry, logic, philosophy, moral and natural (not in the text of the old philosophers, but chiefly in the dark riddles of Duns and other subtle questionists) to his age of 22 years." Strype says he studied other writers "unto the time that Luther began to write. And then he bent himself to try out the truth therein." He said he

prayed heartily God would destroy the power of the bishop of Rome.

William Gace will print some of Luther's works.

Richard Argentine, alias Sexten, will become a physician.

William Barlow will fall off from the true religion but repent and return.

Robert Drury will marry and die March 2, 1535, and his epitaph reads—

"Suche as we are suche schall ye be,
Suche as ye be sometyme were we.
Miserere nostri."

William Turner will become a scholarly clergyman, critic of the New Testament text, translator, botanist, ornithologist, mineralogist, member of Parliament, prolific author of both religious and scientific books and physician to Lord Protector Somerset, the first Protestant ruler of England.

George Stafford, "a man of very perfect life, and approvedly learned in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongues," "like Luther at Wittenberg" would be a "Doctor Biblicus" and lecture on the Bible and not on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard.

Thomas Becon in "The Jewel of Joy" says of his teacher: "George Stafford lectured on Paul which before had so many years been foiled with the foolish fantasies and elvish expositions of certain doting doctors, and, as it were, drowned in the dirty dregs of the drowsy duncers by his industry, labor, pain, and diligence, he seemed of a dead man to make him alive again, and putting away all unseemliness to set him forth in his native colours; so that now he is both seen, read, and heard not without great and singular pleasures of them that travail in the studies of his most godly epistles. And as he beautified the letters of blessed Paul with his godly expositions, so likewise did he learnedly set forth in his lectures the native sense and true understanding of the four evangelists, vively restoring unto us the apostle's mind, and the mind of those holy writers, which so many years before had lien unknown and obscured through the darkness and mists of the Pharisees and papists." He had large audiences. He visited Sir [Rev.] Henry, the conjurer, sick of the plague, brought him to repentance, had all his books burned before his face, caught the infection, and died thereof in 1529. Prior Robert Barnes of the Augustinians was the head of the society, though Shaxton and Forman also presided, but Bilney was the soul of this Cambridge movement.

Strype writes of "those days, when learning and religion began to dawn there; when divers godly men resorted together for conference sake; who also oftentimes flocked together in open

sight, both in the schools, and at the sermons in St. Mary's and at St. Augustine's, where Dr. Barnes was prior, and at other disputations. . . . Their meetings to confer and discourse together for edification and Christian knowledge, were chiefly at an house called 'The White Horse,' which was, therefore, afterwards named 'Germany' by their enemies. . . . They were in mockery called 'Germans,' because they conversed much in the books of the divines of Germany brouth thence."

On their way there they were jeered, "There are the Germans going to Germany!" Where they took their walks was known as "Heretics' Hill." The inn "At the Sign of the White Horse" in St. Benedict's stood on university ground belonging to Catherine Hall between Bull Hotel and King's College with a narrow frontage on Hight street and a rear entrance on Mill street or Plute's lane — "detestable and filthy. This house was chosen because they of King's College, Queens' College and St. John's might come in with the more privacy at the back door." Benet, Pembroke, Gonwell, Peterhouse, and the Augustinian cloister must be added to this roll of honor. The sign of the White Horse remains.

George Herbert Curteis in the Bampton Lectures of 1871, p. 56, writes of Cambridge: "There . . . had been seen a little society of religious men, who . . . encouraged each other in reading the Scriptures, in mutual confession, and similar prescribed acts of personal piety. They visited the prisoners at jails; they preached anew the vital spiritual truths — formerly enshrined, but now obscured, by the ritual and ceremonies of their Church; and were, in short, engaged in reviving religion in England under its ancient forms. The names of twenty-seven of these men have been preserved to us; they obtained the honors of ridicule and social persecution, the house where these first English Lutherans met was nicknamed 'Germany.' And worse things than ridicule were not long in following."

As has been shown above, we have dug up many more than twenty-seven names out of Cooper's "Athenae."

John Bass Mullinger writes in his *History of Cambridge*: "In the old-fashioned inn, as at the meetings of the primitive Christians, were heard again — freed from the sophistries and misconstructions of mediaeval theology — the glowing utterances of the great apostle of the Gentiles. There also, for the first time, the noble thoughts of Luther sank deeply into many a heart; while his doctrines, if not invariably accepted, were tested by honest and devout enquiry and by the sole standard of Scriptural truth. To men who had known many a weary vigil over the fanciful and avid subtleties of Aquinas or Nicholas de Lyra, this grand but simple teaching came home with power. . . . The wranglings of

the theologians and the clamor of the schools died away and were forgotten in the rapture of a more perfect knowledge. Said Becon, one of the youngest, as in after years he looked back: 'So oft as I was in the company of these brethren, methought I was quietly placed in the new glorious Jerusalem.'

Mullinger calls this "the theological school of the university"; we like to think of it as the first English Lutheran Theological Seminary.

Cardinal Wolsey's "contempt of the clergy was looked on as that which gave encouragement to the heretics. When reports were brought to court of a company that were at Cambridge, Bilney, Latimer, and others that read and propagated Luther's books and opinions, some bishops moved in the year 1523 "that there might be a visitation appointed to go to Cambridge for trying who were the fautors of heresy there. But he, as legate, did inhibit it." He forbade Fisher of Rochester and West of Ely, two bitter enemies of the Lutherans, but he sent Dr. Robert Shorton of Pembroke Hall, a well-known favorer of Lutheranism.

This was made the 43rd charge against the cardinal, not punishing "the Lutheran sect. He had hindered the true and direct correction of heresies."

And his acts as to the abbeys "may be weighed to the worst act or article of Martyn Luthers."

Oak Park, Ill.

(To be continued)

WM. DALLMANN

Conscience

Lectures Delivered at the River Forest Summer School, 1941

I

Etymology. — The English word *conscience* is derived from the Latin *conscientia*, which, in turn, is a literal translation of the Greek συνείδησις, *syneidesis*, and which in German is rendered with *Gewissen*. The component parts of these words have the same meaning: *eidesis*, *scientia*, *science*, *wissen* mean *knowing*, *knowledge*, and the prefixes *syn*, *con*, *ge* mean *together with*, *in conjunction with*. The difficulty in determining the etymological concept of the term lies in fixing the relation of the prefix. With what does the prefix *syn*, or *con*, connect the noun *eidesis*, or *scientia*?

The Modern Eclectic Dictionary, defines *conscience* thus: "As the etymology indicates, it signifies *knowledge along with* — but whether with a thing or a person or being, it is difficult to determine." Young's Analytical Concordance defines *syneidesis* as a *knowing with one's self*. Vincent, in *Word Studies in the New*

Testament, says: "It is compounded of *syn*, together with, and *eidenai*, to know; and its fundamental idea is knowing together with one's self." This construction is supported by the use Paul makes of the verb *syneidenai* in 1 Cor. 4:4: "οὐδὲν γὰρ ἑμαυτῷ σὺννοῖδα," *ouden gar emauto synoida*. Very definitely he connects the idea of knowing, expressed in *oida*, through the prefix *syn* with himself, *emauto*. Hence we are justified in translating the noun *syneidesis* with "a knowledge one has together with himself." The same holds good for the other terms *conscientia*, *conscience*, *Gewissen*.

But what may it mean that I have knowledge together with myself? Let us illustrate. If I know a secret together with my neighbor, then this means not only that we both know the secret, but also that each knows that the other knows it. If, then, I say that I know something together with myself, this means not only that I know something, but that I am cognizant of the fact that I know it. The idea expressed in *syneidesis*, therefore, is not a knowledge of things I have acquired by study and observation, but rather a knowledge I have of this knowledge, I know that I know. It is the mind's cognizance of itself, of its thoughts, ideas, and mental operations. Having acquired a bit of knowledge, I am inwardly aware and conscious of what I know. As distinguished from intellectual knowledge, *syneidesis* denotes the awareness one has of this knowledge. Webster defines consciousness as "knowledge of sensations and mental operations, or of what passes in one's mind." This will help us to understand the etymological concept of *syneidesis* as knowledge along with one's self; it is essentially consciousness, an awareness we have of the intellectual knowledge that is in our mind.

In the classical writers *syneidesis* denotes simply *consciousness* without any ethical bearing. The moral implication, which we have in the word *conscience*, as distinguished from *consciousness*, was added later. From a practical viewpoint this is quite understandable. The ordinary man concerned himself little with the psychological concept of the *syneidesis* and *conscientia* of the Stoics; but in his everyday life he was confronted with laws and rules which he either knew by nature or had learned from others and which he recognized as binding upon him. He was conscious of his obligation to comply with them, and there was in him the feeling that he ought to do what he himself recognized as his duty. And it was especially to this last phase of his psychic experience that the term *conscience* was applied. Thus it appears that, on the one hand, the term *conscience* is narrower than the term *consciousness*, inasmuch as it is limited to that consciousness which one has within himself of his conduct as related to a moral obligation.

On the other hand, the term *conscience* is wider than the term *consciousness*, inasmuch as it exercises a definite function in that it determines, according to recognized norms, what is right or wrong in our conduct, urges us to perform what we know to be right, or to abstain from what we believe to be wrong, and approves or condemns our action. Hence conscience, as we understand the term, is not merely an intellectual consciousness of our conduct, but rather a moral consciousness which includes the feeling of obligation and duty.

From what has been said it is evident that conscience is not the mere intellectual knowledge of some law or rule that is to govern our conduct, nor is it the mere state of being conscious of such law or rule, but it is primarily a functioning faculty in man. Indeed, it does not and cannot act without there being present a knowledge of a law and of our obligation under this law. These postulates being given, however, conscience acts as a monitor that holds us to this law, judges our conduct in the light of this law, commends us when we have complied and condemns us when we have not complied with this law. We might compare conscience to a judge in court: he upholds the law, applies it to the offense charged, and pronounces sentence.

This view of conscience appears to be the conception also of Paul in Rom. 2:14, 15: "When the Gentiles, which have not the Law, do by nature the things contained in the Law, these, having not the Law, are a law unto themselves, which show the works of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile [between themselves] accusing or else excusing one another." That the Gentiles have by nature some knowledge of the Law, they show by doing the works required in the Law and by "their conscience also bearing witness." Paul differentiates between conscience and the natural knowledge of the Law. For if the conscience bears witness to the fact that the Law is written in their hearts, it cannot itself be this knowledge. Therefore knowledge of the Law is one thing, and conscience is another thing. "Das Gewissen ist eben nicht identisch mit dem Naturgesetz. . . . Es ist nicht die Quelle der Erkenntnis des Guten und Bösen, sondern es schöpft sein Urteil aus der natürlichen Gesetzeserkenntnis." Stoeckhardt, *Roemerbrief*, p. 90.

There are other reasons why conscience cannot be identical with the knowledge man may have of right and wrong. — Knowledge and convictions, except the natural knowledge of the Law, are acquired. But conscience is not acquired or evolved in man, it is congenital with him. It is a gift of God, which all men have received, irrespective of their learning or ignorance. While it may not be equally alert in all men, there is no rational being with-

out it. — Knowledge and convictions in moral matters differ greatly among men. One regards as right what another regards as wrong. But there is no difference in the function of conscience; it acts alike in all men. While, therefore, the knowledge, according to which conscience acts, may be in error, conscience itself never errs in its unique function of urging man to comply with what he believes to be right. — Our opinions and convictions as to what is morally right change. What Saul regarded as right and God-pleasing, Paul regarded as wrong and damnable, Acts 26:9; 1 Tim. 1:13. But conscience never changes; it never approves what for the time being we know to be wrong, nor does it ever warn us against doing what we know to be right. — Knowledge is forgotten and convictions are lost, but no man ever loses his conscience. Its urgings and warnings may be weak at times, may even cease in certain instances, yet conscience itself is never lost.

While in loose thinking and speaking we often include knowledge and conviction in the concept of conscience, we must, strictly speaking, differentiate between them. There can be knowledge without conviction, and there can be convictions without a response of conscience, as we see from 1 Tim. 4:2: "Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron." Conscience, therefore, is not mere knowledge of a moral code, nor is it the sum total of our moral convictions, but it is rather a faculty (*Vermoege*n), a function of the soul that operates on the basis of such knowledge and conviction as we have and that would bring our lives into conformity with the same.

While we distinguish thus between knowledge, conviction, and conscience, we must also emphasize their close relation and connection. As a judge cannot function without the knowledge of the law, even so conscience cannot function where there is no knowledge of some moral obligation. Paul writes Rom. 7:7: "I had not known lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Paul certainly knew that there was lust in his heart, but as long as he did not know the Law which forbade such lust, his conscience did not bother him. It is therefore foolish to appeal to the conscience of men before they know the law or rule whereby their conscience is to act. Unless we first teach men to know what is right, we cannot expect their conscience to urge them to do what is right. Hence it is necessary that we impart to them a right understanding of the Commandments. In doing so, we must not deal in meaningless generalities, but we must set forth clearly and specifically what the Lord requires of them.

Conscience, however, does not act upon mere knowledge of a law; there must also be, on the part of man, a definite recognition of its obligatory and binding force. We know the Old Testament

laws concerning meat and drink, holy days, new moon, and Sabbath days. But as we do not regard them as binding on us, Col. 2:16,17, our conscience does not urge us to comply with them. We as well as the Catholics know the rule of the Romish Church not to eat meat on Friday. They feel in conscience bound to observe this rule; we do not. Why? We do not recognize the binding force of this church law, while they do. Thus, besides knowledge of a law, the recognition of one's personal obligation to this law is a necessary prerequisite for the functioning of one's conscience. Conscience does not require that the demands of the law be right and its obligation valid — as a matter of fact, this is not always the case — but it does require as a necessary prerequisite for its functioning that we personally *believe* it to be right and binding upon us. Conscience, therefore, never acts in matters which we ourselves do not regard as authoritative and obligatory. For this reason my conscience cannot act on another's conviction, but only on my own.

In teaching the Law, then, we must not only explain its sense and meaning, but must impress upon our hearers also its authority and obligatory force. The mighty God stands behind each one of His commandments, and very significantly He introduces His Law with these words, "I am the Lord, thy God" and adds, "I, the Lord, thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me." Ex. 20:2, 5. These are weighty words, which should impress all men with the mandatory force of these commandments and with their own personal responsibility to God. This is a point we must always bear in mind, both with respect to ourselves and with respect to those that hear us. Our learning and teaching of the Law is effective, not to the extent that we understand and have others understand what the words of the Commandments mean, but to the extent that we and they realize that God requires this obedience of us and that it becomes a matter of conscience with us to observe in our lives what we have learned from the Law. This realization, however, is possible only when we truly regard its commandments as binding upon us.

Conscience is a wonderful gift of God and a powerful help in our work. We may teach ever so clearly and impressively, yet we are not always with our people to watch over their conduct; but their conscience is an ever-present monitor, always urging them to do what they have learned. In fact, a live conscience does more in getting our people to observe in their lives what we have taught them than we may ever hope to do by personal influence. A conscience that is aroused by a knowledge of sin will do more in bringing a man to repentance than our most violent invec-

tives; and a conscience cleansed by the assurance of God's grace contributes more to the peace of mind and soul than anything we may otherwise say. In all our teaching, admonition, and comforting let us enlist the services of this co-worker, let us not merely instruct the intellect, but aim to reach the heart and the conscience of our people.

II

Psychology.—Man is born a rational being; he does not become such by subsequent environment, behavior, and training. All mental powers and faculties, which in the individual may later blossom forth in various degrees and directions, are embryonically present in the infant. While we can exercise and develop these innate capabilities, we cannot create them within ourselves. As little as we can impart to a student the fundamental intellectual powers, so little can we impart to anyone the fundamental essence of conscience. Conscience, therefore, is not something which man gradually acquires as a new accession to his psychic make-up, but it is something he has by nature. It is true that in an infant we do not observe the manifestations of a conscience; still, it is likewise true that as the child grows up and learns to know what he must not do, there is in his heart also the feeling that he ought not do it. The reason that conscience does not function in the infant is that there is as yet no conscious knowledge on the basis of which it can function. But as soon as even little children recognize an obligation, there is something active in them that urges them to comply. This does not mean that they will always follow the prompting of their conscience; still it operates in them, as we can observe when we watch their behavior. Thus we can impart to man the knowledge of moral principles; we can also stimulate and direct his conscience, but we do not create it in ourselves or in others. Conscience is not the product of environment, of habit, or of education, but it is congenital with man, it is a gift of God.

Conscience is not a function of some mysterious gland or nerve cell of the physical body, but of the rational soul. This soul may be viewed merely as the life principle in man, his *anima*. But this *anima* of man, as distinguished from that of the beast, has a rational side, which we may call his *mind*, taking this term in a wider sense. The functions of this *mind* may again be subdivided into intellectual, emotional, and volitional functions.

The intellect is that faculty of the soul which is engaged in all processes of learning, such as apperception, thinking, remembering, imagining, reasoning, knowing. It acquires information, compares and combines what it learns with what it already knows, draws conclusions, arrives at decisions, passes judgments, sets up rules,

etc. Its function is merely instrumental, and the net result of its activities is knowledge. Even when we speak of a creative mind, the mind functions only as an instrument, inasmuch as it makes novel combinations of material present in one's thoughts and arrives at novel conclusions.

Yet, if this were the only faculty of the soul, then all knowledge we acquire would leave us untouched. It would be dead knowledge, and we should be as little affected thereby as the paper in the book is by the wisdom or the nonsense printed on its pages. But the soul is susceptible to impressions; to every thought and idea that enters the mind there is a certain repercussion in the heart. And let us remember, it is not the mind as such that makes this impression, but rather what is in the mind; it is not the intellect that ever has any effect on the heart, but the thoughts, the ideas, and the knowledge which the intellect has acquired; it is not my reason that makes me hate, love, fear, or trust a man, but it is what I know of him that creates this or that attitude in my heart. These impressions are feelings, or emotions, and they are the soul's response and reaction to what the mind has learned and accepted. They are the innermost manifestations of a man's soul; for not what a man does, says, or knows, but how he feels about what he knows, indicates his personal attitude and character. "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he," Prov. 23:7.

While there is a large number and variety of emotions, each determined by the peculiar content of the thought that produced it, they are all either positive or negative, favorable or unfavorable, agreeable or disagreeable. Thus love and hate, conviction and doubt, trust and distrust, etc., are not purely intellectual states, but emotional attitudes, linked up with, and based on, intellectual data.

The soul is capable also of volition. The emotions of the heart are not inert and dead, but, as the very term indicates, they are dynamic and motor in tendency. They are themselves produced, governed, and directed by the thoughts of the mind, but they, in turn, press upon the will, which then starts the machinery to produce action. "Feeling, emotion, and sentiment are tremendously important determinants of volition" (Angell). This power of a certain thought to create an emotion, and the power of this emotion to initiate will, action, is at times modified, checked, and neutralized by inhibitory influences of other thoughts and emotions that dominate man.

The question now is, to which of these three, intellect, emotions, or will, must we assign conscience?

The intellect is the mental instrument by means of which we learn to know the meaning and the obligation of the law, but it does not supply that inward urge to comply with the demands of

the law. This is rather the function of the emotions, through which the soul operates. For when the duties of the law are impressed upon a person, there springs up the feeling that we ought to comply, either do what the law requires, or not do what it forbids. Hence the function of the intellect precedes the function of conscience.

When this feeling of personal obligation becomes sufficiently strong, it acts upon the will to carry out what the law demands. Thus under ordinary conditions conscience controls the will, and the will acts after conscience has acted.

Conscience, then, is acted upon by the knowledge of the mind, and, in turn, it acts upon the will; hence it must lie between the two and must essentially be a matter of feeling and emotion. In other words, conscience is a function of the soul which becomes active after the soul has acted through the intellect and before it acts through the will. What the discriminating power of the intellect has recognized to be right, that man feels he ought to do, and this feeling presses upon the will to carry it out.

In saying that conscience is essentially a matter of feeling and emotion, we would not be understood as saying that *any* feeling or emotion may therefore be called conscience. There are many kinds of feelings. Thus a recognized threat or danger may call forth the emotion of fear; recognized kindness and love of others toward a person calls forth in him the emotion of love towards them; recognized benefactions stir up the feeling of gratitude; recognized promises create faith, etc. Now, when a person recognizes a certain duty and obligation, the emotional reaction is the feeling that he ought to comply with it. And it is this feeling that we call conscience. Hence the term *conscience* does not apply to any kind of feeling one may have, but only to that which is the immediate response of the heart to a recognized obligation and duty. By whatever agency the rules which are to govern our conduct are imposed upon us, when our reason has acknowledged them, there will be, whenever they are put to a test in practical life, in our hearts the urge that we ought to comply with the rule which covers this particular case. This feeling of "oughtness" is the very essence of conscience.

This feeling may be strong, or it may be weak. If weak, it is likely to be overshadowed by other and stronger feelings, and no action results; if it is sufficiently strong, it will induce the will to act in agreement with the thought or idea which produced the feeling. But whether weak or strong, it always urges us on to do what we believe to be right or warns us against doing what we believe to be wrong. Also the aftereffects of our actions are essentially emotional. If we obey the promptings of our conscience,

we experience in our hearts the pleasant feeling of satisfaction; contrariwise, there is the depressing feeling of guilt and shame.

Looking at these functions of the soul, described as conscience, purely from a psychological viewpoint, we must admit that they operate also in matters other than moral. If we know of a certain rule of grammar, we feel that in speaking and writing we ought to observe it; if we neglect to do so, we feel "guilty" under this rule. The laborer feels that he ought to be on the job in time; otherwise his wages may be docked. Having made a promise, we feel that we ought to keep it; if not, we ought to feel very much ashamed of ourselves. Living in a community, we feel that we ought to observe conventional proprieties; if we do, we feel at ease; if we do not, we feel embarrassed. Whenever, therefore, we know ourselves to be under certain obligations, whether assumed or imposed, we have the feeling that we ought to comply with such obligations and that we are at fault if we fail to do so. Psychologically, this feeling of "oughtness" in these cases is identical with conscience. However, we ordinarily reserve the term *conscience* for our emotional reactions to moral obligations. While some may perhaps include in a definition of conscience some intellectual and volitional processes, strictly speaking, *conscience is the emotional reaction of the heart to a moral duty the mind has recognized.*

Webster defines conscience as "moral consciousness in general." This is rather vague. We should prefer "consciousness of one's own obligation to some recognized moral standard." Then he adds, "the activity or faculty by which distinctions are made between the right and the wrong in conduct and character; the act or power of moral discrimination; ethical judgment or sensibility." With this part of the definition we do not agree. For the faculty to distinguish, to discriminate, and to judge between right and wrong rests not in conscience, but in the intellect and reason of man, as will be pointed out below.

The Standard Dictionary has this: "Sense or consciousness of right or wrong." We should amplify this definition to include "the sense or consciousness of the rightness or wrongness of our acts according to an accepted moral principle." The second definition is more acceptable: "Sense or consciousness of the moral goodness or blameworthiness of one's own conduct, intention, or character, together with a feeling of obligation to do or to be that which is recognized as good, often with special reference to feelings of guilt or remorse for ill-doing."

In his *Treatise on Conscience* Charles Scaer defines conscience and its relation to the mental powers thus: "Conscience is that God-given feeling or emotion which, before the act, prompts us to do that which we believe to be right and deters us from doing that

which we believe to be wrong. And after the act it commends us for having done what we believed to be right, or condemns us for having done what we believed to be wrong.

"What relation, then, does conscience bear to the other powers of the mind, the intellect and the will? As all other feelings are entirely dependent upon the intellect, so also conscience. As every judgment is followed by some feeling, so a judgment that is concerned with moral questions, i. e., right or wrong, is followed by a moral feeling, which is conscience.

"So also it is closely related to the will. As every other feeling presses upon the will to make a choice or decision and to carry that decision into action, so also conscience presses upon the will to make a choice for the right and to carry it out into action."

We hold this definition of conscience and of its relation to other powers of the mind to be correct.

III

Functions of Conscience —

We have repeatedly touched upon the functions of conscience. For our better understanding it may be well to set forth more definitely and in detail what the function of conscience is not and what it is.

1. It is not the business of conscience to set up those laws and rules that are to govern our moral conduct. Buechner, *Hand-konkordanz*, p. 493, errs when he says: "Das Gewissen ist das geistige Vermoegen, welches dem Menschen ein unbedingt gueltiges Gesetz fuer sein Handeln aufstellt und ihn richtet. . . . Das Gewissen ist daher theils gesetzgebend, theils richtend. Es ist die innere Stimme Gottes, von Gott dem Menschen gegeben." It is true that conscience is a gift of God and that it judges the conduct of man according to some moral law. But it is not true that it sets up these laws, it is not the voice of God in the sense that through it God tells man what he should do. If that were the case, no heathen could for conscience' sake worship his idol, and no Catholic could for conscience' sake pray to the Virgin Mary. Conscience has no legislative, but only executive and judicial powers; it only urges man to comply with acknowledged laws and judges his action in the light of these laws.

a. It is God, and God alone, who determines what is morally right or wrong, good or evil, and in His Law He tells us what we are to do and not to do. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God," Micah 6:8. "The statutes of the Lord are right. . . . The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether," Ps. 19:8, 9. The conscience

of man has absolutely nothing to do with determining and formulating the moral demands and standards laid down in the Bible.

b. Men also enact laws and set up rules. Because God so demands it, we for conscience' sake submit ourselves to every ordinance of man, 1 Pet. 2:13; Rom. 13:5. Yet our conscience does not enact these laws of the civil government. The Romish Church burdens the conscience of its people with many man-made rules, and while the devout Catholic submits to them, his conscience did not establish them.

c. Private opinions sometimes control the conscience of men. For conscience' sake some of the early Christians would not eat meat of animals that had been sacrificed to idols, 1 Cor. 8:7. It was not wrong to eat of that meat, as we see from v. 8 and from 1 Cor. 10:25. But these weak brethren thought they became guilty of idolatry if they ate of this meat. It was a private opinion which had grown into a conviction that controlled their conscience. Yet it was not their conscience that gave them this idea; it merely urged them to comply with it.

Thus conscience never sets up a moral rule or code for its own guidance, it does not establish the ethical principles of our conduct, it merely prompts us to observe what we believe to be right and to eschew what we believe to be wrong.

2. It is not the function of conscience to discern between right and wrong *per se* and to evaluate the ethical value of the moral principles to which it submits. When Saul persecuted the Church and blasphemed the Christ, his conscience did not censure him for doing a thing that was essentially wicked; on the contrary, he says, "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do (θεῖν πολλὰ ἐναντία πράξαι, *dein polla enantia praxai*) many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth," Acts 26:9. And the conscience of Ravaillac did not discern that he was committing murder when he killed Henry IV of Navarre, 1610, but he thought he was doing God a service. Conscience, indeed, judges the rightness and wrongness of our own actions according to the norm we have ourselves adopted; yet it does not judge the rightness and wrongness of the norm itself. To do this, is the function of the intellect of man on the basis of such considerations as seem sufficient unto him. In doing so the reason of man often errs, and its judgment and resulting convictions are wrong. Yet conscience never revises or corrects the judgments of the intellect; whatever they may be, right or wrong, it will enforce them, urging man to comply with what at the time he believes to be right.

This certainly must bring home to us our tremendous responsibility in teaching our people. We dare not be careless as to what we teach, hoping that their conscience will set right what we say

wrong. If an erroneous teaching has taken root in our hearers, their conscience will urge them to comply with it. Only when their conscience is controlled by the right kind of knowledge, obtained otherwise, will their conscience refuse to be guided by any false teaching we offer.

3. It is not the function of conscience to establish and to recognize the binding force of a law or moral code. Whether a law applies to us, we must learn from the law itself; whether we submit to it, depends upon our recognition of the authority of him who stands behind this law. But no sooner have we acknowledged our duty under this law, we at once feel obligated to observe it. Whenever, then, a situation develops where this law applies, we feel that we ought to do what the law requires. Thus the Seventh-Day Adventist is convinced in his own mind that the Sabbath laws of the Old Testament are still in force and binding upon all men; hence his conscience constrains him to observe the seventh day of the week. We also know these laws; but having learned from Col. 2:16, 17 and Rom. 14:5, 6 that they are no longer in force, we do not recognize them as binding upon us. For this reason it is not a matter of conscience with us to observe any particular day. However, in neither case is it the conscience of man that determines whether or not the observance of these Sabbath laws is obligatory, but it is rather the understanding, right or wrong, which a person has of these Bible texts.

What, then, is the function of conscience? Briefly stated, it is this: Conscience holds us to comply in practice with those moral principles our mind has recognized to be binding upon us. However, we may distinguish between its function before and after the act, between *conscientia praeveniens* and *conscientia consequens*.

Conscientia praeveniens.—Before the act there is in our heart the distinct feeling that we ought to do what we believe to be right, and thus conscience is that inward urge or drive toward right action and conduct; or, there is the feeling that we ought not do what we believe to be wrong, and thus conscience is that inward monitor that would keep us from doing evil. Conscience is the "categorical imperative" in man. After he has learned and accepted a moral principle, his conscience tells him with an imperative tone and with an authority from which there is no appeal that he must now comply with the same. It does not merely advise man or plead with him, but categorically it commands and insists that he act according to his convictions; it tolerates no evasion, accepts no excuse, and is not deceived by pretense and camouflage, but demands unconditional and full compliance with what we ourselves believe to be right. Any appeal from our conscience is futile because conscience merely enforces those moral

principles we have ourselves adopted. You cannot get away from your own conscience.

Conscientia consequens. — Conscience does not cease to function after the deed is done. The words of Paul Rom. 2:15: "Their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts between themselves accusing or else excusing one another," point to this *conscientia consequens*. When we have obeyed the voice of conscience, there arise in our mind thoughts that excuse and defend us against whatever may challenge the correctness of our conduct, and our conscience justifies and commends us for having acted as we did. As a result we experience that peaceful and gratifying feeling which we call a good conscience. — But if we have acted contrary to the dictates of our conscience, there arise in our mind thoughts that accuse us and uphold the charge of guilt over against any attempt to justify our action by spurious arguments, and our conscience reproves and condemns us. As a result we have that disquieting and annoying feeling of shame and guilt which we call an evil conscience.

Attributes of Conscience —

1. *Conscience is universal.* — Conscience is not a peculiar gift of grace bestowed upon Christians in their conversion, but it is an equipment every man has by nature; it is congenital with him. Paul tells us that also the Gentiles have it, Rom. 2:14, 15, and we can observe its influence even in the life of the savage. While for certain reasons it is not equally sensitive and active in all men, there is no man on earth without a conscience. Beside the intellectual powers of thinking and reasoning, it is especially conscience that distinguishes man from the irrational brute, which is never influenced in its actions by moral considerations.

2. *Conscience is a precious gift of God.* — It is for a very definite purpose that God preserved in man not only a rudimentary knowledge of His Law but also a conscience. The natural knowledge of the Law shows man, in a measure, what he should and what he should not do, but it is conscience, bearing witness to this Law, that urges man to comply with the Law. The Law shows us the way, but conscience prompts us to go this way; it is that ever-present monitor that would have us walk in the light of the knowledge we have, it is the deputy of God to enforce His Law. Conscience, therefore, is a powerful factor in the life of the individual and of the community. Without it man's knowledge of right and wrong would remain dead and not influence his conduct; without it every Dr. Jekyll would be a Mr. Hyde; without it the moral structure of society would break down and communal life become an impossibility. Because of his greater intelligence the conscience-

less man would be far more dangerous to his fellow men than the conscienceless wolf, for as there would be no inward urge to hold him to a moral code, only carnal appetites and selfish interests would sway him and direct his actions. How often in our own lives has not that little voice of conscience determined our course? And may we not assume that it has acted likewise in others? It is true that the conscience of many is often misguided and that men do not always conform to recognized standards of morality for conscience' sake but rather because they find it expedient to do so. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that by and large conscience is a powerful determinant in the lives of men.

3. *Conscience is uniform in all men.*—Conscience does not act differently in different people. As the physical heart beats alike in all men, so conscience acts alike in the Greek and in the barbarian. That two men, each obeying his conscience, act differently in a given case, is not due to a different functioning of their conscience, but to a difference in their moral conviction. We also grant that the sensitiveness with which conscience responds to conviction and the force with which it speaks vary not only in individuals but also in the same person. With some it is quite alert, with others it is rather sluggish; at times it speaks with a loud voice, then again it is but a faint whisper; it may continue to work on us for a longer or a shorter time, all which depends upon the treatment it receives. But as to its essential function, there is no difference between the conscience of the cultured man and that of the savage.

4. *Conscience is unchangeable.*—Opinions and convictions change. What at one time we believed to be right we now know to be wrong, and *vice versa*. But this does not involve a change in conscience. Whatever for the time being may be a man's conviction, that his conscience urges him to do. As far as his conscience was concerned, it acted alike both when Paul persecuted Christ and when he preached Christ Crucified; in both instances he did what he thought he ought to do.

5. *Conscience is incorruptible.*—Men can be bribed to do what they know to be wrong, but they can never bribe their conscience to sanction their wrongdoing. There may be other considerations, such as the fear of men, the desire to please and to favor someone, the need in which we find ourselves, that would approve and seemingly justify a wrong act, but conscience will never do so. Peter might have tried to use as an excuse for his denial of Christ the danger in which he found himself or a momentary weakness of faith, but his conscience would have had none of it. Because conscience acts on man's own conviction, it cannot do otherwise than approve what he believes to be right and disapprove what he

believes to be wrong. Unless the conviction is first changed, conscience abides by its judgment. "Conscience is the only incorruptible thing about us." Fielding.

6. *Conscience is infallible.* — Those who deny the infallibility of conscience evidently include in their concept elements that are, strictly speaking, not of the essence of conscience. In its proper function, conscience is the urge of the emotions to comply with the law of the mind. And in this it never makes a mistake, it never tells us to do what we know to be wrong and never warns us against doing what we know to be right. If men act contrary to their convictions, it certainly is not their conscience that prompts them to do so. It is true, the conscience of Paul moved him to do what was wicked, but at the time he was convinced that he ought to do that very thing, Acts 26:9. For men often err in their judgment as to what is right or wrong, and conscience will urge them to follow their conviction; but even in this case conscience does not err in its specific function, it simply prompts man to walk in the light he has. The mistake was made by the intellect of man. "Reason deceives us often, conscience never." Rousseau. "Conscience is infallible as a prompter to action, but not as judge between right and wrong." Scaer.

Saying that conscience is infallible does not mean that it will inevitably function in every instance in which a man is about to do what he knows to be wrong. For if one persistently disregards, and wilfully acts contrary to, the promptings of his conscience, these become weaker and weaker until they finally cease. This is what Paul means when he speaks of a "conscience seared with a hot iron," 1 Tim. 4:2, and of the "hardness of their [Gentiles] heart, who being past feeling (*ἀπηλγηγότες*, *apelgekotes*)," Eph. 4:18, 19. Though they speak lies in hypocrisy and give themselves over to lasciviousness, there is in them no feeling of shame and guilt. Their conscience no longer responds, it neither warns them before the act, nor does it accuse them after the act. However, this does not mean that it is altogether dead or that such people have entirely lost the faculty of conscience. For while it may be callous and hardened with respect to certain sins, it may be sensitive and active in other respects; there is an honesty among thieves. And it frequently happens that an apparently dead conscience again becomes active, yea, violently active, even in those matters where it had ceased to function.

This brings up the question *Is conscience always active?* Our answer is "No." The faculty and power of conscience is always present in man, but there must be something that starts it. The motor in your car may have a thirty-horse-power capacity, but there must be something to start it. What is it that starts con-

science to function? Knowledge of the Law and consciousness of our obligation under the Law are necessary prerequisites for the functioning of conscience; yet of themselves they will not incite conscience to act. Conscience actually functions only when in a given life situation our moral convictions are put to a test. A monitor and judge cannot function where there is no occasion for admonition and judgment. Thus we know the Fifth Commandment and are convinced that it is binding upon us. Yet, as long as there is in our conduct no possible conflict with its demands, our conscience is quiet. But as soon as a contingency arises where we might possibly act contrary to this Commandment, conscience at once springs into action, warning us not to do what we know to be wrong and commending us for having listened to its warning or condemning us for having acted contrary to our conviction. Also the remembrance of past sins, committed perhaps many years ago, may now or in the future stir up our conscience to accuse and condemn us. Thus David prayed Ps. 25:7: "Remember not the sins of my youth, nor my transgressions." From personal and professional experience we know that the remembrance of past sins often causes a good deal of conscience trouble.

But we ask, Why does conscience not react in every instance in which our actions are likely to conflict with our conviction? Why does conscience not always respond, and why does the will not always yield to its urgings? Since it is the same soul that operates through the mind and the conscience and the will, one should think there would be neither hitch nor halt in the operation. That which the soul through the mind recognizes to be right and which the same soul through conscience urges us to do, this same soul through the will should also put into practice. Why should the soul operating through the will fail or refuse to do what the same soul operating through conscience urges the will to do?

The answer we find in Rom. 7:14-23. We have here the confession of a believer. Paul confesses that the Law is good and right, v. 16, and he delights in this Law after the inward man, v. 23, and would therefore gladly follow its precepts. Yet he finds that in his flesh dwelleth no good thing, v. 18, and that the law in his members, that is, the law of sin, v. 25, the original depravity of his nature, wars against the law of his mind, v. 23. The soul of a Christian is the battleground of two conflicting forces; it is swayed either by the new man or by the old man. According to the new man the Christian delights in the Law of God and is willing to comply with it, but the old man often interferes and will not let him carry out what his conscience would have him do. All Christians have had this experience. They were impressed by a sermon they heard, their conscience urged them to do what they had

learned; but before they carry out their resolve, the old Adam bestirs himself, "their flesh lusteth against the Spirit . . . so that ye cannot do the things ye would," Gal. 5:17.

In a way this applies to the Gentiles also, whose conscience bears witness to the Law of God written in their hearts and would, if obeyed, effect a *justitia civilis*. However, the demands of this Law, which even the Gentiles recognize to be right and good, do not always agree with the selfish interests of man. As these interests gain the ascendancy in his mind, he will ignore the voice of his conscience. It is, therefore, the natural depravity of man that often hinders and prevents him from doing what his conscience demands. Man is "double-minded," Jas. 1:8, has a dual personality, is both a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde. Goethe expresses a similar thought in *Faust*:

Zwei Seelen wohnen, ach, in meiner Brust!
Die eine will sich von der anderen trennen:
Die eine haelt in derber Liebeslust
Sich an die Welt mit klammernden Organen;
Die andere hebt gewaltsam sich vom Dust
Zu den Gefilden hoher Ahnen.

This phenomenon can be explained psychologically. As pointed out above, conscience centers chiefly in the emotions, it is a feeling that we ought to do what we know to be right. But the heart is capable of other feelings, *e. g.*, the feeling of fear. One may perhaps fear that he will be in mortal danger if he acts according to the dictates of his conscience. Now if this feeling of fear becomes stronger than the feeling of duty, then fear will induce the will to do its bidding. It was fear of men that made Peter set aside his conscience and deny the Lord. It was love of money that made Judas ignore the warnings of his conscience and steal from the bag. It is the desire to please men, the fear of their ridicule, the love of sin, etc., that often move men to override the dictates of their conscience. Whatever emotion is strongest in the heart, controls the will and leads to action. It must, therefore, be our aim so to direct and strengthen conscience in ourselves and in others that it may hold its own over against the evil inclinations of the heart.

A psychoanalytical study of conscience and its function is a great help to us in the treatment of conscience.

IV

The Treatment of Conscience.—If conscience is to serve its God-intended purpose, it must be properly treated. We may discuss the treatment of conscience under the following headings:

- A. *How to prepare conscience for proper action.*
- B. *How to treat conscience when it acts.*
- C. *How to deal with conscience after man has acted.*

A

How shall we prepare the conscience of our people for right guidance and action in life? We hear it said again and again, "Let conscience be your guide." This is correct, inasmuch as the voice of conscience must always be obeyed. Yet, if we are to follow conscience as our guide, it must itself be properly guided. Conscience is like the gas and the motor in our automobile; they make the thing go, go anywhere, but it depends upon the driver to steer this moving power in the right direction. Conscience is the moving power that urges us to do what we believe to be right and to avoid what we believe to be wrong. But as to what is right and wrong, conscience is blind. It does not examine and question the correctness of our beliefs and convictions, whatever they may be; it impels us to go through with them. For conscience' sake Paul persecuted the Church, Acts 26:9; for conscience' sake men offered their sons as burnt offerings to Baal, Jer. 19:5; for conscience' sake some would not eat meat of animals that had been sacrificed to idols, 1 Cor. 8:7; for conscience' sake the devout Catholic will not eat meat on Friday. For conscience' sake men have done the most foolish and also the most abominable things. Conscience guides us in our actions, as it is itself guided and directed by the knowledge of the mind. Teach a man wrong principles of moral conduct, and his conscience will urge him to observe them. Conscience has no light of its own, but it lives and acts in the light of what man has learned. Hence the importance of proper instruction.

The source from which we can get reliable information as to what is morally right in the sight of God and man is the Bible. Here God Himself speaks to us and shows us what is good and what He requires of us, Micah 6:8. His Word, therefore, is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path, Ps. 119:105. By taking heed unto His commandments we shall lead a clean, virtuous, and godly life, Ps. 119:9.

As conscience holds us responsible to a Higher Power, to God, it should be bound and controlled by nothing but the Word of God. Hence we who are called to guide the conscience of others must be careful that we do not impose upon them our own ideas and man-made laws but that we teach only what God has commanded, Matt. 28:20. In so doing we must also impress upon them that it is by no means optional with them whether or not they do these things, but they must be led to realize that God requires obedience to His commandments and will hold him responsible who fails in the least, Jas. 2:10; Lev. 10:2. If, then, conscience is to guide us in the right way, we must have the

correct understanding of the meaning of God's Law and must recognize our personal obligation under this Law.

In this connection we may speak of the erring, the doubting, and the enslaved conscience.

The erring conscience.—Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as an erring conscience. Conscience never errs in its single function to urge man to do what he believes to be right. The error lies not in man's conscience but in his cognition and knowledge. Because his conviction is wrong, his consequent conduct will be wrong. Conscience never questions the rightness of a man's convictions; whatever they may be, it simply urges him to live up to them. It is, therefore, not conscience that errs in its function but reason that erred in its judgment.

There were people at Corinth who had a conscience with respect to eating meat of animals that had been sacrificed to an idol, 1 Cor. 8:4, 7. Now, there was no harm in eating this meat, nor was there virtue in not eating thereof, v. 8; 1 Cor. 10:25-27. Yet these people thought it was wrong. "For some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience, being weak, is defiled." It was not their conscience that erred, but it was their knowledge and understanding that was at fault; they believed something to be wrong which God had not forbidden.

We also have people in our congregations to whom indifferent things, and sometimes very trivial things, are weighty matters of conscience. The proper treatment of these people is not to tell them to ignore their conscience but rather to instruct them, so as to bring about a change in their conviction. We must also be careful that by our example we do not lead a weak brother to act against his misdirected conscience. "For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in an idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols, and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?" 1 Cor. 8:10. "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother offend," v. 13. See also 1 Cor. 10:27-33.

The doubting conscience.—Again, there is no such a thing as a doubting conscience. The doubt lodges in the mind; we do not know whether or not what we are about to do is right. And because we are not sure of ourselves, our conscience does not and cannot urge us to action. We do not see clearly the way we should go; hence there is a feeling of uncertainty in our hearts, which tends to paralyze all action. Where there is conviction, conscience acts, and where there is no conviction, conscience does not

act. — But while conscience will not impel man to acts which to him are doubtful, it will function after he has acted in such cases. For now there is something sure, he has acted, and he has acted in doubt. And at once his conscience will accuse and condemn him. This is what Paul teaches Rom. 14:23: "And he that doubteth is damned" [before his own conscience] "if he eat, because he eateth not of faith" [with the conviction that he is doing the right thing]; "for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." In such cases we must suspend action until we become "fully persuaded in our mind," Rom. 14:5, as to what we should do. The proper treatment of persons with a "doubting conscience," is not to cajole them to override their scruples but to remove these scruples by patient instruction, which must be very clear and well authenticated from Scriptures.

The enslaved conscience. — An enslaved conscience is controlled by one's own superstitions and imaginations or by the dictates and opinions of men. The conscience of many a pagan is a slave to his superstitious notions, and the Romish Church has burdened the conscience of its members with many man-made laws and ordinances. And there are others who seek to enslave their fellow men by foisting upon them their own ideas as the commandments of God. But we read 1 Cor. 7:23: "Be not ye the servants of men." This is particularly true in all matters of conscience. Conscience holds us responsible to God; therefore He, and He alone, can bind it, not man. It was this liberty of conscience that, under God, was restored to mankind by the Reformation of Dr. Martin Luther. Let us zealously guard it; let not our own conscience be enslaved by others, nor let us enslave their conscience by spurious teaching. The proper treatment of an enslaved conscience is again instruction. Men must learn that neither priest nor Pope nor anyone else may impose upon their conscience man-made laws, nor should they themselves burden it with obligations of their own invention. Only when it is directed and controlled by the Word of God, does conscience serve its God-intended purpose.

B

How are we to treat conscience when it actually functions? The answer is very simple: The voice of conscience must be obeyed in every case. We submit the following three reasons.

1. To act against conscience is sin. Paul writes Rom. 14:23: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." The word *faith* here does not mean the faith which trusts in the merits of Christ, but being in this verse contrasted to *doubt*, it means *conviction*. Ordinarily conviction acts on conscience in such a way as to produce in the heart the feeling that we ought to do what we know to be right;

hence, to act against one's own conviction is to act also against one's conscience. And to do this is sin. Nor must we regard it a minor offense, which is of no serious consequence, but being a transgression of a plain statement of God's Word, it brings judgment and perdition upon the offender. For 1 Cor. 8:11 we read: "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died." Paul means to say that if by our example we lead a weak brother to sin against his conscience, then the weak brother does something because of which he shall perish. Hence sins against conscience invoke the wrath and punishment of God as fully as sins committed against the Decalog. — This is a point we must bear in mind for ourselves, and to which we must again and again call the attention of our people. It is a sin when we act contrary to the First or the Second or any other Commandment, but it is just as much a sin when in any matter that involves a moral issue we act contrary to the dictates of our conscience. Conscience is God's deputy in our hearts, a monitor, whose admonitions and warnings must always be obeyed.

2. To act against conscience brings personal discomfort and distress. There will arise thoughts that accuse us, and though we may cast about for all manner of excuses, conscience will not be deceived, it will tell us, "You cannot plead ignorance, you knew that you should not have done this thing, I warned you; but you would not listen, you stand condemned by your own conviction." A guilty conscience takes the joy out of life and gives one a foretaste of hell. If, however, we obey the voice of our conscience, we experience a definite satisfaction, which makes for peace of mind and joy of heart. "Ein gutes Gewissen ist ein sanftes Ruhekissen." For the sake of our own mental and spiritual tranquillity we should always obey the dictates of our conscience.

3. To act against conscience tends to weaken its influence and to destroy moral character. As man abuses his conscience by continually disregarding its voice, he weakens its force until it finally ceases to function. He reaches a point where he commits the grossest crimes "without feeling" the sinfulness of his acts, Eph. 4:19. And this destroys his moral character. For moral character consists not in the mere knowledge of moral principles, but in their constant observance. As conscience is the very power that urges man to observe these principles, his moral character is definitely tied up with his conscience. Thus to act against conscience has, if continued, the most devastating effect on character. Hence "labor to keep alive that little spark of celestial fire called conscience." Washington.

With reference to the things in which conscience demands our unqualified obedience we may distinguish three possibilities:

they may be allowed, they may be commanded, they may be forbidden in the Word of God.

1. *In matters allowed.*—In Rom. 14 Paul speaks of weak brethren who had scruples of conscience concerning things which God had neither commanded nor forbidden, concerning which, therefore, one could do what he pleased. "For one believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs," v. 2. For some reasons these people thought it was wrong to eat certain meat. But in v. 14 Paul tells us: "I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself." Hence there is no law that we must abstain from certain food. See also 1 Tim. 4:3. Therefore he writes 1 Cor. 8:8: "Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat, are we better; neither if we eat not, are we worse." While the eating of meat is an adiaphoron, yet Paul tells us: "But to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean," Rom. 14:14. If such a person, then, were to eat what according to his own conviction he ought not to eat, he would defile his conscience, 1 Cor. 8:7, and would be committing a real sin in a matter which, of itself, is allowed. "For whatever is not of faith is sin," Rom. 14:23. Thus we know that we are free to eat meat on Friday and during Lent; but if a Catholic, whose conscience is bound by the law of his Church, would do so, he would not merely transgress a man-made rule but would also be sinning against God inasmuch as he acts contrary to his conscience. Therefore even in matters which God allows we must not disobey our conscience nor prevail upon others to do so; while an erroneous conviction must be corrected by proper instruction from the Word of God, its promptings must in the meantime be obeyed.

In matters which God has neither commanded nor forbidden we are free to act as we please; yet we must take heed "lest by any means this liberty of ours becomes a stumblingblock to them that are weak," 1 Cor. 8:9. If by an inconsiderate use of our liberty in matters allowed we lead a brother to act against his conscience, emboldened by our example to do what in his heart he believes to be wrong, then we sin against him and wound his conscience, and in so doing we sin against Christ, 1 Cor. 8:9-13. As far as our own conscience is concerned, we are free to act as we please, but for the sake of a weak brother's conscience we must at times refrain from using our liberty, 1 Cor. 10:28-32. Thus it becomes a matter of conscience for us to respect the conscience of them that are weak.

However, if the erring brother is so set in his mind that our example would not mislead him; if he insists that we also abstain from things which God has allowed; if he demands that by our

compliance we recognize his erroneous views as though they were divine requirements, then we must by no means yield to him. For the sake of charity to a weak brother we should be ready not to make use of the liberty we have, Rom. 14:15; 1 Cor. 8:9; but if a confession of the truth is involved, Gal. 2:3-5, then we must stand in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free and not be again entangled with the yoke of bondage, Gal. 5:1, nor let our liberty be judged by another man's conscience, 1 Cor. 10:29.

2. *In matters commanded.* — The situation is worse when a man acts contrary to convictions that are in full agreement with the Word of God. He knows that God does not want him to steal, his conscience also warns him not to do it, and yet he steals. In this case he commits a double sin, one against the Seventh Commandment, the other against his conscience. This is a very serious matter, this kills faith. For Paul tells us 1 Tim. 1:19: "Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck." He means to say that he who puts away a good conscience by acting contrary to its demands makes shipwreck concerning his faith, i. e., loses faith. We cannot trust in God for the forgiveness of our sins while at the same time we are intent on committing sins against Him. "Faith cannot exist and abide with, and alongside of, a wicked intention to sin and to act against conscience." *Trigl.*, p. 795. If persisted in, such sins will "sear conscience as with a hot iron," 1 Tim. 4:2, so that man is "past feeling" the sinfulness of his act, Eph. 4:19, and thus they *may* ultimately lead to hardening of the heart and to the sin against the Holy Ghost.

When speaking to our people about sin, we certainly must impress upon them that sin is the transgression of the Law and brings God's wrath and curse upon them; but at times it is advisable also to tell them that by sinning they violate their conscience, disturb their peace of mind, kill their faith, and drive the Holy Spirit from their hearts. Because of the complacency we sometimes find in our own hearts and among the members of our congregations, it may be well to remind ourselves and them of the fact that the grace of God indeed covers all our sins, but that no one can *have* and *enjoy* this grace if he lives in sins against his conscience, for thereby faith, by which he lays hold of the forgiveness prepared for him, is destroyed.

3. *In matters not recognized as forbidden.* — A most difficult situation arises when a man feels himself in conscience bound to do what, unbeknown to him, is forbidden by God. Thus it may happen that with a good conscience he will do what is evil in the sight of God. Paul says of himself: "I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day," Acts 23:1; and 2 Tim. 1:3 he

tells us that "from his forefathers" he served God with a pure conscience. But the same Paul confesses that he had been a blasphemer and a persecutor and injurious, 1 Tim. 1:13. How can that be? When Paul persecuted the Christians, he acted according to the dictates of his conscience. "Verily, I thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth," Acts 26:9. Thus Paul sinned; still, because he did not know better, he had, while making havoc of the Church, a good conscience before God. After he was converted, his sins, indeed, weighed heavily upon him, as we see from his confession 1 Tim. 1:13-15. Even so a heathen to this day may have a good conscience when he worships his idol; in fact, his conscience urges him to do so; but in obeying his conscience he is sinning against the First Commandment. If, on the other hand, he would not worship his idol, he would sin against his conscience, which is likewise forbidden by God. The same is true of a devout Catholic; he sins whether he prays to the Virgin Mary or whether he does not.

How shall we treat such a case? Shall we insist that a man give up his sinful practice even before he is convinced, or shall we let him continue in his sin until we have convinced him? By no means should we advise such a one to act against his conscience, for that also would be a sin, and it would tend to destroy his moral character, inasmuch as thereby we break down in him that very power which urges him to do what he believes to be right. Besides, if we teach him to disregard his conscience when it prompts him to worship his idol, he may learn the lesson so well that he will with equal ease disregard his conscience when it prompts him to worship the true God. No man is so foolish as to destroy the motor of his car because it is headed the wrong way; the thing to do is to turn it in the right direction. Even so we must not weaken or destroy the driving power of a moral life by inducing anyone to act contrary to the dictates of his misdirected conscience, but rather let us teach him from the Word of God the way he should go.

We are here not discussing the question whether such a person should be received or retained as a member of the Christian congregation. In God's Church God's Word alone shall rule, and by it the conscience of every Christian must be governed. Whoever teaches and lives otherwise than God's Word teaches, cannot, even if it be a matter of conscience with him, become or remain a member of the Christian Church. But also in this case instruction must not be neglected. — If it is in our power to do so, we must also prevent people from doing a wicked thing which they think they ought to do, Acts 23:12-24. If someone thinks he is doing God a service and therefore ought to kill a person, John 16:2, then

we must try to set him right by proper instruction; if we do not succeed, we must seek to prevent him from carrying out his wicked purpose. There is a difference between preventing a man from acting according to his conscience and persuading him to act contrary to his conscience; in the one case he does not defile his conscience, and in the other he does.

C

How are we to deal with the "conscientia consequens"? The primary function of conscience is to urge man to comply in his conduct with those moral laws which he himself recognizes as binding upon him. But after man has acted, either obeying or disobeying that inward monitor, there are certain aftereffects, pleasant or unpleasant, which "register" in his conscience. The primary function may be brief, and it comes to an end the moment the deed is done, but the secondary function may continue for a long time after. Also these aftereffects have a pedagogical value; if they are pleasant, they will encourage us to obey our conscience in the future; if they are unpleasant, they will discourage us to repeat the offense.

Under this heading we shall speak of a good conscience, an evil conscience, and a callous or hardened conscience.

A good conscience.—If man obeys the voice of his conscience, his thoughts will approve his action. Conscious of having done what he felt he ought to do, there is in his heart a pleasant feeling of satisfaction and contentment. A good conscience is a precious boon, well worth the efforts of any man to obtain and to retain. Paul says Acts 24:16: "Herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offense toward God and man." Paul does not mean to say that he always succeeds, as little as he means to say Phil. 3:12 that he is already perfect; but he exercises (*ἀσκήω*, *asko*) himself, he labors, he disciplines himself, to have a good conscience. Because of the depravity of our nature it is not always an easy matter to be successful. Carnal appetites, selfish interests must be repressed, and whatever would turn us from the path of recognized duty must be pushed aside. This means self-discipline, self-denial. But with the help of God's Spirit we must diligently and constantly strive to have a conscience void of offense toward God and man. While a good conscience as such requires no special treatment, it is well to admonish our people occasionally that for their own peace of mind they must keep their conscience clean.

An evil conscience.—If one disobeys the voice of his conscience, it will for this reason not simply cease to function. But his thoughts will accuse, convict, and condemn him for having

done what he knew to be wrong, and there will be in his heart that mortifying feeling of guilt and shame. A guilty conscience is the worst thing a man can suffer in this life. This truth was realized even by the pagan Greeks. The Erinyes, those snake-haired women who pursued the evildoer and inflicted madness, were personifications of the evil conscience. Schiller in "Die Kraniche des Ibikus" graphically describes these Furies:

Wohl dem, der frei von Schuld und Fehle
 Bewahrt die kindlich reine Seele!
 Ihm duerfen wir nicht raechend nahn,
 Er wandelt frei des Lebens Bahn.
 Doch wehe, wehe, wer verstohlen
 Des Mordes schwere Tat vollbracht!
 Wir heften uns an seine Sohlen,
 Das furchtbare Geschlecht der Nacht.

Und glaubt er fliehend zu entrinnen,
 Gefluegelt sind wir da, die Schlingen
 Ihm werfend um den fluecht'gen Fuss,
 Dass er zu Boden fallen muss.
 So jagen wir ihn ohn' Ermatten —
 Versoehnen kann uns keine Reu' —
 Ihn fort und fort bis zu den Schatten
 Und geben ihn auch dort nicht frei.

A person may live in luxury and plenty, he may enjoy the respect and acclaim of his fellows, yet within there is that gnawing worm, his guilty conscience; the evil he has done is haunting him, disturbing his slumbers, and taking all joy out of life. He may repent of his sin, pay conscience money, as Judas did, Matt. 27:3-8; yet tears will not wash away his guilt, and contrition will not restore peace to his heart. He will try to forget, and in the stress of activity and the whirl of pleasure he may forget for a time, but again and again the specter of guilt looms up in his consciousness. And when its furies are unleashed, they sometimes drive a person to despair and suicide. But even death will bring no relief, "for their worm shall not die," Is. 66:24.

How must such a conscience be treated? That friends excuse our action and even praise our courage, will not relieve us of the compunctions of conscience and rid us of its terrors. Even if the priests and Pharisees had tried to comfort Judas in his distress — which they did not even try to do — it would not have appeased his conscience. Conscience holds us guilty before God; any easement must, therefore, come from Him. There is nothing in the wide world that can restore peace to a troubled soul except the assurance of God's grace and forgiveness. And thanks be to God, this assurance we have in the Gospel. "If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart," 1 John 3:20, and His grace is greater

than our guilt, Rom. 5:20. The blood of Christ can purge our conscience from dead works, Heb. 9:14, and in the assurance of faith we have our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, Heb. 10:22. Faith in the atoning merits of our blessed Savior is the *only* and the *sure* cure for an evil conscience.

When our people gather in church to hear from our lips the Word of God, let us bear in mind that there may be among them such as are secretly troubled in their conscience either by some sin recently committed or by the remembrance of the sins of their youth, Ps. 25:7. They are in need of comfort. And to us God says, "Comfort ye, comfort ye My people," Is. 40:1. Let us not fail them. While on the one hand we must arouse the conscience of our people to a realization of their sin and guilt before God, we must, on the other hand, comfort and establish their hearts with the assurance of God's forgiving grace.

A callous or dead conscience.—This condition of conscience is brought on by consistently ignoring its warnings and accusations. In this case it becomes less and less responsive, until it finally ceases to act. However, it is not quite correct to say that it is dead. For while it may not function in those things in which its warnings were not heeded, it may be very active in others, and it may also become active again even in those matters in which it was dormant for some time. Judas was a thief, John 12:6. At first his conscience, no doubt, reproved him for his pilferings, but as he disregarded its warnings, it gradually became callous in this respect. He went from bad to worse and finally betrayed his Master for thirty pieces of silver. But when he saw that Jesus was condemned to be crucified, his conscience was furiously aroused, accusing him not only of the betrayal of his Lord, Matt. 27:4, but, no doubt, also of his love of money that led him to commit this terrible crime.

To treat a hardened conscience is not an easy matter. It may be necessary to ban and damn the man to bring him to his senses. God Himself sometimes uses severe measures and bitter life experiences to break the hardness of the heart. But as for conscience itself, man must be led to recognize his obligation under the Law and to realize his responsibility to God. It may be advisable to approach him along those lines where his conscience still functions and from there proceed to those points where it is seemingly dead.

From the preceding discussion it must be apparent that conscience is a powerful factor in the life of man. The knowledge of moral principles would be dead and inoperative except for the executive power of conscience which puts them into effect. Itself controlled and directed by those laws which man has recognized and adopted, it, in turn, directs and controls the conduct of man.

While it is true that the affections and lusts of the old Adam enter largely into the life of every individual, it cannot be denied that conscience, operating on sound moral principles, develops a moral character and produces a moral life. Its influence enters into the various ramifications of human conduct, and, subjecting man to the judgment of God, it reaches out into eternity.

We are counselors of conscience to our people. What a responsibility! Let us see to it that in all matters of moral conduct we give them sound counsel and instruction from the Word of God. But at the same time, let us address ourselves not merely to their intellect, but follow the advice Dr. F. Pieper gave his students: "Suchen Sie das Gewissen zu treffen." If the things we teach our people become a matter of conscience with them, then their conscience will urge them to observe in life what we have taught them. In our pastoral practice we have to deal with all sorts of consciences, and it requires wisdom and tact to treat them properly. Professionally, therefore, it is of importance to us to give some thought and study to the functions and the treatment of conscience.

River Forest, Ill.

E. W. A. KOEHLER

Outlines on the Wuertemberg Epistle Selections

Fourth Sunday after Easter

1 Thess. 2:9-13

Work, work, work! Each and all, severally and jointly, as individuals, as congregation — work! Some complain that they are overtaxed by legalistic compulsion or overworked by overorganization. Before a congregation can work at all, work must have been done upon it; if it should continue working, work upon it must keep it in working condition. Today, then, we shift from work rendered by the congregation to work done upon the congregation for its welfare.

The Welfare of the Congregation Requires Work

1. God's work
2. The pastor's work
3. The Word's work

1

The Gospel of God is mentioned v. 9, and v. 13 we find the word ἐνεργεῖται, energize, exert energy. Paul preached the Gospel of God to the congregation. He preached that Christ died for them and that He arose again. Justification. Christ worked to obtain it for man; He labored to redeem, Is. 43:24, 25; 53; Eph. 5:2, 25-27. Active and passive obedience. — Christ justified the Thessalonians by His travail and triumph before they knew of it. Rom. 5:8, 10. He worked for the congregation before it existed by working that it

might exist and enjoy all spiritual privileges. His work is its foundation. — Then the Holy Spirit did His work upon the Thessalonians, v. 12. What was the result? The same as Eph. 2:1-10. Sanctification. Third Article. Complete salvation wrought by divine labor and operation.

We read of no complaint made by the Thessalonians of being overtired, but rather: 1:3, and later: 2 Thess. 1:3, 4; 3:13. Have any among us lost zeal in the spiritual work assigned to us? Are we becoming weak, while the Thessalonians were strong under the pain of persecution? Is there any indication of Laodicean lethargy? Let us evaluate what God has wrought upon us from eternity, in time, now, and will work for eternity. His work upon us is truly undeserved work of love. The Gospel of God tells us that. 2 Cor. 5:15.

2

The text reads like a faithful pastor's official report to his congregation. Paul labored and travailed at the birth and for the life of the congregation — exhorting, comforting, charging, preaching. (And all this, waiving his right to an adequate salary, v. 6, which at best would be insufficient in comparison with his invaluable service, 1 Cor. 9:11, offering for his privileged disregard of the divine order, Luke 10:7; 1 Cor. 9:14; Gal. 6:6, 7; 1 Tim. 5:17, the excuse of Christian pastoral love, rejecting the thought of establishing a precedent.) Paul served with intense zeal publicly (preaching) and privately (every one of you), tirelessly (without ceasing). He adorned the doctrine with a godly life, v. 10; he served well as an example to all, in prosperity and in adversity. He notarizes, as it were, his report, as one would an affidavit, with a solemn oath, calling upon God as the witness of truth and upon the congregation as the evidence, the exhibit, of the truth. — Everyone was in need of all this labor upon that congregation. Paul labored strictly along the plan designed by God for the welfare of the congregation, and he thanks God for the success of the plan.

No pastor should, on peril of his soul, report faithfulness to doctrine, practice, life, to God and his congregation unless he can confirm his report with an oath without committing perjury. — God emphasizes the importance of the pastor's work. According to God's order, Eph. 4:11-15, the welfare of the congregation requires the service of a faithful pastor. An extended vacancy is detrimental, as also experience proves. But the pastor must not be expected to do the tasks which the members must perform personally as their own Christian duties.

Let the congregation learn to estimate the work of the pastor and to evaluate his example of life. Then the congregation, realizing what work is being done for its welfare, will not become weary in well-doing.

3

God works for our welfare by means of the Word, which is the spirit of His mouth, v. 13. The faithful pastor, God's co-worker, works for our welfare by means of the Word, which is the power of God unto salvation. God, the Author of the Word, gave it by inspiration. We see that Word in operation in the congregation at Thessalonica, as God's power effectively working on the hearers, administering doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction, comfort, as the entire text states, perfecting the believers in faith and life for time and eternity, because it gives and conveys Jesus Christ.

"Also in you" the Word proves to be the power of God. You see its success upon us. Every other work which would crowd out the work of the Word must be energetically opposed. The welfare of the congregation comes only by means of the Word. Luke 11:28. You are a highly favored congregation. Show your appreciation by observing actively v. 12.

G. H. SMUKAL

Fifth Sunday after Easter

1 Tim. 6:11-16

Many people have false ideas about the way to eternal life. Some believe that eternal life will come to them as a due reward from God for their good deeds; others believe that eternal life will come to those who hold certain religious opinions and observe certain ceremonies, regardless of their conduct in life. We must know the truth about the way to eternal life. If one misunderstands road directions, one may get lost; but one can turn back and start over. However if one does not understand the way to heaven correctly, he will be lost forever, unless he is shown the right way.

Lay Hold of Eternal Life!

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Have faith in the Savior</i> | 3. <i>Flee from sin</i> |
| 2. <i>Confess His name</i> | 4. <i>Follow after Christian virtue</i> |

1

"Fight the good fight of faith"; to do this, one must have faith in Jesus. This most important truth, briefly stated here, is repeated in many places in the Bible: Mark 16:16a; Rom. 1:17; 4:3; John 3:16; and many others. It is evident that faith in Jesus is the hand that takes the gift of eternal life.

But what is faith? We must know whether we have faith, 2 Cor. 13:5. Faith is not a sweet, pleasant feeling that everything will be all right; it is a conviction, based on God's promise, that our sins are forgiven and that God will take us to heaven. If you know that you are a sinner cast out by God, if you are sorry that

you sinned, if you believe that the blood of Jesus has cleansed you from your sins and that God has forgiven them all: that is faith in the Savior, based on God's Word and promise. If you have that faith, then you have eternal life, John 3:36.

2

We cannot, however, retain this faith unless we are willing to confess Jesus' name. St. Paul tells Timothy that he has made a good confession, v. 12, even as Jesus did before Pilate, v. 13. And this confession voiced by Timothy is demanded of Christians in many places in Scripture: Rom. 10:9; Phil. 2:11; 1 John 4:15. Men of God, who were on the way to eternal life, confessed their faith: Matt. 16:16; John 20:28.

Some things are desirable in the Christian's life, but not absolutely necessary for salvation: Walther League, voting membership, ladies' aid, men's club, etc. Since denial of our Savior and His holy name will rob us of salvation, Matt. 10:32, we must confess His name and let people know that we are Christians. There must be something about us that tells people what we are. One way of making this confession is by belonging to Christ's Church, by attending services and by going to Communion. Open adherence to the true Church is a courageous confession of Christ.

3

Those who desire eternal life must flee from sin, v. 11. "These things" — what things? The apostle had named various sins in the preceding verses, particularly, v. 10, the burning desire for money and the power that comes from money. The love of money is a ruinous thing and causes men to err from the faith, v. 10b; Saul became covetous and lied, 1 Sam. 15:13; Ahab became covetous and committed murder, 1 Kings 21; Achan became covetous and committed theft, Josh. 7:21; Judas became covetous and betrayed Christ. And today the love of money leads men to theft, embezzlement, cheating, and many other sins. If a man does these things, if he serves sin in any form, he will err from the faith and be lost. Therefore a man of God must flee these things if he wants to remain on the way to eternal life. And anyone who believes that his sins are forgiven through his Savior will gladly flee these things out of gratitude to his Savior, who showed him so much love.

4

And the fourth requirement for those to consider who have laid hold on eternal life is to follow after Christian virtue, v. 11b. It is not our privilege to choose whether we care to attain these virtues or not. They are fruits of faith. Where there is faith, these virtues will show themselves: obedience to God, kindness to

others, patience with another's weakness, readiness to forgive, and many more.

We may be assured of receiving eternal life because we are called unto it, v. 12. God will give us that to which He has called us, Rom. 8:30.

Yet, having received eternal life as a gift of God's grace, we must lay hold on eternal life, not stand listlessly by, but grasp it with vigorous effort, an "all-out effort." St. Paul commands Timothy to make such an earnest effort toward his salvation, vv. 13, 14; to be prepared for the coming of Christ in His glory, vv. 14-16. Let us, then, prove our faith in Christ by confessing His name, by fleeing sin and following after virtue, lest we lose our hold on eternal life. Hymn "Fight the Good Fight."

FREDERIC NIEDNER

Ascension Day

Heb. 4:14-16

Our text speaks of a high priest. Many have a somewhat vague conception of the peculiar work or office of a priest. Properly speaking, a priest is one who offers a sacrifice to God. In the Old Testament we read that priests daily offered sacrifices of lambs or goats to the Lord.

The ordinary priest brought these daily sacrifices. But the Jews also had a *high priest*. He was the one who alone was permitted on the great Day of Atonement to enter the Most Holy Place of the Temple, there to bring a bloody sacrifice first for his own sins and then for the sins of the people, Heb. 9:7-22. Now, all this sacrificing by priests and by the high priest was symbolic only. Those sacrifices were to remind the people that in God's own appointed time a true, genuine High Priest was to come who was to bring one sacrifice for all sins and, having finished His work, return to His Father, Heb. 1:3.

Of this true High Priest and His ascent into heaven our text speaks. It answers the question

Why Should We Confidently Trust Our Ascended High Priest Jesus Christ?

We should confidently trust in Him

1. *Because this High Priest, Jesus, is acceptable to God.*

He is acceptable

a) Because of His sinless life, v. 15b. The high priests of the Old Testament were sinful. Before they could appear before God for the people, they had to bring a bloody sacrifice for their own sin. Jesus does not need to do this. He is sinless, Heb. 7:26, 27; John

8:46. He is the only man who because of His own life pleased God, Matt. 3:17; Ps. 2:7.

b) Because of His sacrifice. The sacrifices of the Old Testament did not actually atone for sin, Heb. 10:4; Micah 6:6, 7. They only pictured the true, valid, and efficacious sacrifice. This valid, sin-removing sacrifice was made by Jesus when He offered up Himself, Heb. 10:10-12; 1 John 1:7. Therefore our text calls Jesus "a great High Priest." This sacrifice is precious beyond all calculation. Therefore it pleased God.

c) Our text mentions another reason why we may be sure that Jesus, our High Priest, is acceptable to God; namely, He has even now passed through the heavens, i. e., above all heavens, v. 14. It is for this reason that we celebrate our Lord's ascension. We even set aside a specific day. We are to be sure Jesus, our High Priest, has gone where we hope to go. We are not only sure that God will accept Him; we know that He *has* accepted Him. Our High Priest's credentials have been approved. He has finished all that was to be done for us, and is now pleading our cause with the Father. He has told us: John 14:3; 12:26. Certainly we have every reason confidently to entrust our case to this High Priest, since God has received Him into the glories of heaven.

2. Because He is so well fitted to represent us and to aid us.

Our text does not only declare that this High Priest is pleasing and acceptable to God, but also that He is so well fitted to represent us and to aid us, v. 15.

a) He was "tempted in all things like as we are." A physician who does not understand your case is liable to make great mistakes, but we may have confidence in one who thoroughly understands our case. Jesus is not a stranger to our plight, our struggles, temptations, weakness. He Himself passed through life with all its trials and temptations. He was misunderstood, He was unjustly criticized and condemned. He was threatened and flattered. Satan tempted Him. Well-meaning friends misunderstood Him and troubled Him. Open enemies maligned and persecuted Him. Traitors betrayed Him. He is no stranger to the difficulties, trials, and little sorrows which beset us. Indeed, He is an understanding Helper.

b) And more than this, He is a merciful High Priest. "He is touched with the feeling of our infirmities," He sees our danger, He knows the craft and deceit of our enemies; and He pities us, He wants to help us. Even the Jews, who rejected Him, experienced His love and kindness. He went after the lost sheep, He gave His life for the sheep; and over those who rejected Him, He wept and said, "If thou hadst known," etc., Luke 19:41, 42. See

how He dealt with His weak disciples Peter and Thomas. Certainly that is the kind of high priest we weak and sinful people need.

Should all this not give us boldness to approach the throne of God's grace? We do not offer Him the filthy rags of our own righteousness, but the spotless, precious sacrifice of His own beloved Son. Nor do we alone offer all this; the perfect, sinless Jesus, who is pleasing to God, offers God this sacrifice for us. Come then, v. 16.

This Jesus, our High Priest, has been preached, proclaimed, and pointed out to all the world by all true prophets from the beginning of the world, Acts 10:43; the angels of heaven have proclaimed Him; God from heaven has declared Himself satisfied with this High Priest and His sacrifice for our sins; the Holy Spirit continually testifies of Him and glorifies Him. Today again you have been told of the sacrifice for your sin. Remember Acts 4:12. But: Hymn 220.

MARTIN S. SOMMER

Sunday after Ascension Day

Col. 3:1-10

Nearly all things are now being put to the test, e. g., blood, lungs, heart, intelligence. The testing of spiritual life is mostly neglected. Yet that is even more important than all other testing. 2 Cor. 13:5; Ps. 139:23, 24.

Christians, Put Your Christianity to the Test

1. *Do you set your affections on the things above?*
2. *Do you possess the evidence of sincerity?*

1

V. 1a. Being Christians, you have been raised with Christ from spiritual death unto spiritual life, in Baptism, 2:12, through faith of the operation of God. By faith you are partakers of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, and all the blessings accruing therefrom, Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:26, 27. By faith you have the forgiveness of all your trespasses, 2:13b, 14, through Him who has blotted out the handwriting.

V. 3. Ye are dead, dead to the Ceremonial Law and to man-made ordinances, 2:16-23, especially 20; dead to sin. Alive in Christ, dead to sin. Rom. 6:12, 14.

V. 3b. Your life is hid with Christ in God. Christ, though ever present with us, is now invisible, removed from the world of sense. He now lives to God, Rom. 6:10. Even so the Christian's spiritual life. The world knows nothing of it; it knows neither Christ nor the Christian. It is wholly ignorant of the fact that Christ dwells in the believer, blesses him with all spiritual blessings in heavenly

places, and motivates his life. To be sure, unbelievers cannot but notice some of the manifestations of the Christian's spiritual life. They ask, What is it that makes the Christian so different from others? Because they find no answer, they are ever ready with the verdict "Hypocrites." Even the Christian himself, though he is aware of his spiritual life and all that it includes, finds it all, its source and power, to be a mystery.

But it will not always be hid, v. 4. Christ, who is your Life, will appear, become visible to all men. Then shall ye Christians also appear with Him in glory. 1 John 3:2.

Therefore: Seek, keep seeking — set your affections on vv. 1b, 2. On what? Not on things on earth. Paul is evidently referring to what he has just written, 2:8 and 16-23, vain philosophies and man-made religions. They can give man no comfort, no direction or strength for the service of God. The same is true of all other things on earth: money, honor, etc. A Christian finds pleasure in his family, in his work, in art and music, etc. That is not wrong, provided it is of a kind that has God's approval, even blessing. But he must not forget that his chief concern should be directed toward the things which are above. He should with his whole heart seek Him of whom Paul has written: 1:13-23; 2:9-15.

Christians, put your Christianity to the test. Do you follow this admonition? Luke 12:34, 31a. Is your Christianity worth much or little to you? Remember that all things else are of little importance and become insignificant in comparison with Christ and His blessings.

2

When you were raised with Christ, you became dead to sin, etc., vv. 9, 10. This, however, is a process which never comes to an end during your lifetime. Eph. 4:22, 24. "The Old Adam in us should by daily contrition and repentance be drowned and die, with all sins and evil lusts." V. 5, mortify, put to death, your members which are upon the earth. Rom. 6:13, 19b.

Put off the sins that defile your own person, sins against the Sixth Commandment, v. 5b; the First Commandment, v. 5c; Matt. 6:24; 1 Tim. 6:9, 10. — For all these the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience, v. 6. Already in this life. Is God now pouring out His wrath upon our people because of just these sins? Surely on the day of reckoning. Remember v. 7. But now you are Christians.

Put off all sins against the neighbor, vv. 8, 9.

In your conversion you have put on the new man, v. 10; Eph. 4:24. Do you let the "new man daily come forth and arise, who shall live before God in righteousness and purity forever?" (See the Christian virtues mentioned in the verses following the text.)

Christians, put your Christianity to the test. To put it in another way, is your new man constantly battling against the old, who is forever trying to gain the upper hand? If not, then you are a Christian in name only. If, on the other hand, you are constantly engaged in this warfare, that is an evidence of your sincerity. But just how determined and successful are you in your battle? Are you going from victory to victory, or are you suffering many defeats? What is to be done in order to become more successful? Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, 2 Pet. 3:18; Col. 1:9-11. To this end make diligent use of the means of grace, v. 16. Pray for growth and strength. Watch and pray, Matt. 26:41; 1 Cor. 16:13.

R. NETTZEL

Pentecost Sunday

Acts 2:32-41

"Men and brethren, what shall we do?" This is the question which bewildered men and women are asking in these perilous times. Confusion and uncertainty have gripped the world and our nation. Also Christians look to the future with foreboding.

That question was asked also at the first great day of Pentecost, and the first Pentecost sermon furnished the answer. It is an answer which is the answer today.

Men and Brethren, What Shall We Do?

1. Repent
2. Look to the exalted Lord
3. Be assured of His unfailing promise

1

The people whom Peter addressed in his sermon had seen Christ in their midst for a long time. But in this audience there were many who had rejected Him; Peter openly accuses them of having crucified the Lord, v. 36. Now the enormity of their wrongdoing flashes through their minds; they "were pricked in their heart," v. 37. This was no time for them to shift the blame to others—to the leaders, to Pontius Pilate, or others—but to ask, "What shall we do?" Peter's answer is: "Repent."

We also have lived through many pleasant and care-free years. Did we perhaps ignore Christ, regard Him as superfluous in our lives, find no time for His Word and for prayer? The Pentecost message to us also is this: Repent. Turn to the Savior in heartfelt sorrow and ask His forgiveness. Evil days are always a call to repentance. Amos 4:6-11; Haggai 1:9-11.

In his urge to repentance Peter adds: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation," v. 40. The world is always the same:

greedy, selfish, the enemy of God's kingdom. The members of the visible Church are often not only in the world but also of the world. Neither long years of economic prosperity nor years of depression have brought a general return to God's Word. The Pentecost message of our text is a message also to the Church of our day to save itself from this untoward generation, Rom. 12:2, and again avow its loyalty to God's Word.

2

Pentecost is removed by fifty days from Easter; yet in reality the events of these festivals are inseparably connected. The miracle of the first Pentecost was the work of the risen and exalted Lord, vv. 32, 33. The Old Testament writer had foretold the exaltation of the risen Lord, vv. 34, 35. This first Christian congregation was to look to the exalted Lord Jesus as the Ruler over all the Church and over all His enemies.

Today forces are at work in this world that seem to argue that the devil, not Christ, has assumed control: war, hatred, destruction, skepticism, despair, and reckless abandon to indulgence are seeking to overthrow everything that the Church in centuries of Christian work has attempted to build up. Can it still be that the Lord rules over all?

Through all this turmoil we have the assurance that the exalted Christ has all things under His feet, Ps. 2:4-6. We may not always see the manner of His rule, but as Christians we have the assurance of the fact of His rule, 1 Cor. 15:24, 25.

The message of Pentecost bids the whole Church to look up to the exalted Savior, who rules over all things.

3

The people of our text did not only hear words of warning, but the words of this first Pentecost were also words of far-reaching promises.

a) Remission of sins, v. 38. (Original words call this a "sending away" of sins.) No sin too great to be "sent away," for even those who had helped in crucifying the Lord, v. 36, receive this promise. Cp. Is. 1:18. This assurance is still an assurance today.

b) Gift of the Holy Ghost, v. 38. This is the gift which every believer has by virtue of faith in Christ. (Note the word *δωρεάν*, not *χάρισμα*.) John 7:38, 39; 2 Cor. 1:22. We know Jesus as our Savior, trust and believe in Him, rejoice and take comfort in Him. This hope cannot be taken from the Christian even in the darkest hour of danger and destruction.

c) This promise is unto "you and your children and to all that are afar off," v. 39. What a wide scope to this promise! Our chil-

dren, though growing up in these perilous times, are not a "lost generation." Rather, they are an especial urge towards parental efforts to give them the one thing needful while the opportunities are still here. Neither is this present time an excuse for indifference to missionary work, for the promise is to them that "are afar off."

Great perils and opposition met the early Church; great perils lie in the path of the Church today. But that same exalted Lord who made His promises to the early Church come true will also be faithful in His promises to us.

H. O. A. KEINATH

Pentecost Monday

1 Cor. 2:7-16

The Holy Ghost is the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. Not third in rank, however; but coequal with the Father and the Son in majesty and glory. The same divine honor and worship we extend to the Father and the Son we should give to Him. To do this, we must know, and know from experience, His work.

The Blessed Work of the Holy Spirit

1. *In Holy Scripture He reveals the Gospel.*
2. *Through Holy Scripture He brings us to the knowledge of the Gospel.*

1

The preaching of Christ Crucified is God's wisdom, v. 7. God ordained it. He prepared it, v. 9. To man it is a mystery, hidden, something man cannot know except by divine revelation. It was hidden to high and low, to all alike, vv. 8, 9. How, then, could man have been its author? To "us," the apostles, God revealed these things by His Spirit, v. 10. The Spirit of God can reveal them. He is omniscient, "searcheth even the deep things of God." "Not a process of investigation is meant, but a result, namely, full, adequate, profound comprehension." (Ps. 139:1 and 7.) Lenski, Eisenach Epistle Selections. Man is specifically excluded as a source of the things of God, v. 11. And not only did the Holy Ghost teach the apostles the things which are freely given us of God, v. 12, but the very words in which they clothed them, v. 13. The revelation of the Gospel is the work of the Holy Ghost.

What a blessed work this is! The Gospel speaks of the deep things of God. Christ is the King of Glory, yet died on the cross. By His death He devoured death and won for us life and immortality. He seemingly succumbed to the devil, and yet His apparent defeat was Satan's destruction, Heb. 2:14. God extends

mercy to the sinner, yet avenges sin. He justifies the ungodly and yet is just. The Gospel proclaims and offers the free gifts of God: justification, grace, peace, reconciliation. The Gospel tells how the Lord is minded. He hates sin, but loves the sinner. He rejects the impenitent and proud, but shows grace and mercy to the remorseful and the wretched. Surely, deep mysteries revealed by the Holy Ghost in Scripture.

2

What is man's natural attitude toward the Gospel? Man does not recognize it. Not even the rulers of this world perceive it, v. 8. The leaders of Jews and Gentiles, Caiaphas, the Council, Pilate, were chiefly responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. These rulers are typical of all the unbelieving leaders of this world. In spite of their superior mentality, educational privileges, and attainments they do not acknowledge Jesus as their personal Savior. Are the common people more favorably disposed to the divine Redeemer? "They all say unto him, Let Him be crucified," Matt. 27:22. Opposition to the Gospel is the spirit of the *world*, v. 12.

V. 14. "The natural man" even at his best does not admit the word of the cross to his heart. Salvation solely by faith in the crucified Lord of Glory does not make sense to him. He rejects this marvelous message as foolishness. And, alas, he cannot judge otherwise! It is impossible for him to know the things of the Spirit of God, to repose confidence in them. Paul himself in his natural state knew not the Gospel. Acts 26:9; 1 Tim. 1:13; cp. Luke 18:34. Man must get a spirit different from that of the world, a new spirit, mind, attitude, from God, v. 12, eyes to see the surpassing glory of the Gospel, ears to hear its celestial music. The mind must be enlightened, the will changed, the heart renewed.

How is this to be brought about? By means of the Gospel. "We speak," vv. 7, 9, 13. In Corinth Paul spoke among people imbued with the spirit of the world, puffed up with human wisdom, lovers of sin rather than of God. But many of them became spiritual. And what did it? The Gospel as the means by which the Holy Spirit operates, vv. 3, 4; 1 Cor. 6:11; 2 Cor. 3:3, 7, 8.

The preaching of "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified," is preceded by the preaching of the Law. Paul shows up natural man in his impotence, wickedness, and folly in order to break down his pride. Today, too, sinners need to realize that they must be born again or be forever shut out from glory. On broken and contrite hearts the Holy Spirit works the miracles of His grace. Matt. 11:25.

Let us ever keep on reading and hearing the inspired Scriptures. By the grace of the Holy Ghost we shall then, in the mirror of the Law, behold ourselves as we really are, spiritually blind and

dead, hostile to God, totally depraved, lost; and in the Gospel we shall see Jesus Christ set before our eyes as crucified. Thus we shall receive that knowledge and spirit which prompts us to say: "When I survey the wondrous Cross," etc., Hymn 175.

PAUL G. BIRKMANN

Trinity Sunday

Titus 3:4-8

Trinity is the forgotten festival. Even in circles where the full church year is observed, Trinity, after the climax of Easter, seems an anticlimax. Trinity should be the queen of festivals; it commemorates the sum total of all that God has done for man's salvation. So it is a fitting conclusion of the festival half of the church year; the great task which began at Bethlehem is now finished, and we praise the Triune God for its accomplishment. So we may well take the angel song which introduces the first festival as our theme for this last festival: there it was promise and prophecy; now it has become fulfillment.

Glory to God in the Highest and on Earth Peace, Good Will toward Men

1

"Glory to God in the highest"—that is the message of Christmas, of the Father who in His kindness and love to men spared not His only-begotten Son but delivered Him up for us all.

We needed saving; by sin we had lost our soul and were inevitably drifting into perdition. We cannot save ourselves; we are corrupt and can do no good when we come into the world, v. 5. Moreover, we do not even want to save ourselves; we do not know, nor do we want to believe, that we are lost. There was no possibility that a plan for our salvation should originate with us.

There was nothing in us that could have moved God to plan our salvation; we are rebels against His authority; nothing that might mitigate our guilt. In perfect justice God could have said: You had your chance; now take the consequences.

But God is love; so He planned our salvation, vv. 4, 5. Nothing but His grace moved Him, vv. 4, 5, 7. No one but the all-wise God could have found a plan that would violate neither His justice nor His grace. All glory to Him!

2

"On earth peace"—that is the message of Lent and Easter, of the Son, who bore our sins in His own body on the tree and was delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification.

God, though loving and kind, could not deny His justice; His Law, given to man, had to be fulfilled by man; and man, transgressing the Law, had to bear the punishment of his transgression. So the Son of God became man and our Substitute, v. 6; He did for us what we could not do, fulfilled the Law; He paid the debt which in all eternity we could not pay; and when He said, "It is finished," the justice of God was satisfied; the wall of partition that separated between us and our God was broken down; and God said so by raising Christ from the dead.

Now there is peace between God and man; all men on earth. God is reconciled; we are justified, v. 7, declared righteous for the Son's sake. And we are restored to the place from which we had fallen and the inheritance which we had lost, v. 7.

3

"Good will toward men"—that is the message of Pentecost, of the Spirit who comes now, sent by the Father and the Son, to impart to us through Word and Sacrament the blessed fruit of the great atonement.

The work of the Spirit is individual work. "What Christ has done for all mankind," so He assures the individual, "that He has done for you." He convinces the sinner of this truth and leads him to set his trust firmly on this blessed fact. So He regenerates him, makes a new man of him, who now knows that he needs saving and knows where and how he finds salvation.

And the natural and inevitable result is that this new nature also becomes evident in life and action. While the final result of our salvation is the perfect restoration of the divine image in heaven, this restoration must begin while we live here, v. 8; Christ has redeemed us for a life of service to Him and to our fellow men.

So, then, the prophecy of the angel song has become history. "Salvation unto us *has come* by God's free grace and favor."

All blessing, honor, thanks, and praise
To Father, Son, and Spirit,
The God that saved us by His grace—
All glory to His merit!
O Triune God in heaven above,
Who hast revealed Thy saving love,
Thy blessed name be hallowed.

THEO. HOYER



Miscellanea

Κοινωνία: Communicatio or Communio?

Notes on 1 Cor. 10:16 ff.

The question has been asked by readers of this periodical: "Does the Greek word κοινωνία in 1 Cor. 10:16 mean *communicatio*, as many Lutheran dogmaticians and exegetes have explained it, or does it mean merely *communio* [Luther: *Gemeinschaft*; King James Version: *communion*; British Revised Version: *communion* or *participation*; so every other modern translation that we were able to compare]?"

1

That the word κοινωνία may have the meaning *communication* is avouched by dependable Greek scholars of ancient and modern times. Thus in traditional Greek dogmatic terminology the *genus maiestaticum* was denominated by Theodoret (perhaps the greatest of the earlier Christian exegetes, a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, d. ca. A. D. 457) κοινωνία τῶν θεῶν, the communication of divine attributes, sc., to the human nature, and in this connection he speaks also of κοινωνία ὀνομάτων, the communication of divine names. Theodoret, who certainly knew Greek, thus uses κοινωνία in an active, contributive sense. The expression κοινωνία τῶν θεῶν afterwards remained the Greek *terminus technicus* for the "communication of divine attributes" in dogmatic parlance. (Cf., for example, Dr. Pieper "Christliche Dogmatik," Vol. II, p. 160 ff., footnotes. We refer to this popular work because it is accessible to our pastors.) Melanchthon, an excellent Greek scholar, explains κοινωνία in 1 Cor. 10:16 to mean *id, per quod fit ipsa communio*, "that by which the communion takes place" (cause for effect: metonymy). This exposition was adopted by the erudite Reformed divine Grotius, who also knew Greek well, and is substantially sanctioned by Meyer (cf. Commentary, sub. l.), who writes: "The cup, i. e., its contents as these are presented and partaken of, is the medium of this fellowship: it (the fellowship) is realized in the partaking. The sense therefore is: Is not communion with the blood of Christ established through partaking of the cup?" He adds in a footnote that "Hofmann, too, comes to this in substance after all," explaining further in what respect Hofmann's exposition in certain details departs from his own.

Following Melanchthon, many Lutheran exegetes have explained κοινωνία in the same active sense of communication. The popular Hirschberg Bible transcribes 1 Cor. 10:16 a as follows: "Ist er [der Kelch] nicht (ist es nicht ausgemacht, dass er wahrhaftig sei) die Gemeinschaft (das in Gemeinschaft und Verbindung mit dem Blut Christi stehende und uns desselben teilhaftig machende Darreichungsmittel) des Blutes Christi?" The same is afterwards said of the bread. The Weimar Bible adds to the words "die Gemeinschaft des Blutes Christi": "Wird uns nicht vermittelt des gesegneten Kelchs im heiligen Abendmahl das wahre, wesentliche Blut Christi zu trinken dargereicht und mit-

geteilt?" (Is it not true that in Holy Communion through the consecrated cup the true, substantial blood of Christ is presented and communicated to us that we may drink it?) The same is again substantially said of the bread. Bengel adds to the word *communion* in this passage: "That is, while we partake of the cup, we truly partake of the blood of Christ," which is essentially Melancthon's explanation of *κοινωνία*. Some Lutheran exegetes really combine the two meanings: *communication* and *communion*, thus, however, endangering the hermeneutical principle *Sensus literalis unus est* (The literal sense can be but one). Dr. Kretzmann writes on the passage: "The entire passage breathes the consciousness, the certainty of Christian fellowship, first, *with Christ, in whom they* [the communicants] *participate through the wine and the bread* [the ancient Melancthonian explanation], and, secondly, *with the other communicants who partake of the same bread and of the same cup.*" Dr. Lenski offers this explanation: "*Communion denotes actual and real participation in the blood of Christ. . . . The cup, i. e., its contents, received by drinking, mediates this 'communion.'*" In Schaff-Lange's commentary we read on the score: "*Koinonia* is not the precise equivalent of *communication* . . .; it may denote *participation*, which, however, is certainly not without *communication*. But the word here is used by way of metonymy for the means of communicating or participating." This exposition is accepted also by Hodge, who says: "The cup is the means of participating." The *Lutheran Commentary* describes the term *κοινωνία* as signifying *sharing* or *participation*, and then goes on to say: "The meaning is that by drinking of the consecrated wine, with it we become partakers of the blood of Christ. The Greek word, properly speaking, does not mean 'communication'; and yet, since the cup is the sharing in the blood of Christ, no violence is done the meaning by declaring that the cup is a means of communicating, or imparting, Christ's blood, or a communication of Christ's blood." Zahn's commentary has this to say: ". . . das Wort *κοινωνία* selbst, das mit dem Genetiv der Sache, sei es einem epexegetischen . . . oder einem partitiven, . . . ueberall eine wirkliche Beteiligung aussagt. Dass Leib und Blut Christi dabei von Paulus als die Organe des heilschaffenden Sterbens Christi gemeint sind, beweist die deutliche Beziehung auf das erste Abendmahl. Wenn endlich doch nicht das Handeln der Teilnehmer selbst, sondern Brot und Kelch es sind, von denen solche Anteilnahme ausgesagt wird, so wird daraus hervorgehen, dass die *κοινωνία* zwar durch jenes vermittelt, aber der eigentlichen Ursache nach in diesem gegeben ist; doch deutlich ist zugleich, dass Brot und Kelch diese *κοινωνία* eben dadurch sind, dass mit ihnen ein sakraler Vollzug vorgenommen wird. Dass in jener heiligen Handlung an Kelch und Brot eine objektive Wirkung im Sinn realer Anteilnahme an Christi Leib und Blut sich knuepfe, betont danach das Ganze."

Let this suffice for the exposition according to which *κοινωνία* in the passage either means *communication* directly or else by implication. Others again find in the term *κοινωνία* no more than the meaning: *communion, participation, partaking*. So Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*: "*Koinonia*: participation, fellowship." So also *The Expositor's Greek Testament*: "The Lord's Supper constitutes a com-

munion." So already in ancient times. Tyndale: "κοινωνία: partaking." So, moreover, Jamieson, Fausset and Brown: "Communion — the joint participation." Other commentators say substantially the same thing. Lexicographers encounter the same difficulties with the term as do the exegetes. The well-known popular *Woerterbuch* of Schirlitz assigns to κοινωνία only three classes of meaning, which, however, are basically the same: (1) Gemeinschaft (communion), and then: Umgang, Verkehr (association), Zusammenhang, Verbindung (connection); (2) Das Anteilnehmen an einer Sache, die Teilnahme, participation; (3) Die Teilnahme an dem Werk fuer die Heiligen, der Veranstaltung von Kollokten, which essentially is nothing more than participation or even only fellowship. The much-used Thayer gives as general meanings of κοινωνία: fellowship, association, community, joint participation, intercourse; in particular: (1) participation, or the share which one has in anything; (2) intercourse, fellowship, intimacy; (3) a benefaction, jointly contributed, a collection, a contribution as exhibiting an embodiment and proof of fellowship. Preuschen-Bauer, more modern and scholarly than those quoted so far, has the following threefold classification of meanings: (1) Gemeinschaft, enge Verbindung, innige Beziehung; (2) Erweis der Gemeinschaft, Erweis bruederlichen Zusammenhaltens (*abstractum pro concreto*), for which he quotes Heb. 13:16: "But of doing good and of communicating (κοινωνίας) be not forgetful." To this he adds faintly: "To this perhaps belongs also κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (the communion of the blood of Christ), the means for acquiring an intimate relation to the blood of Christ (body of Christ), 1 Cor. 10:16 a, b; (3) Das Anteilhaben an, die Beteiligung an, die Teilnahme an, participation. But again he says: "Perhaps here should be added 1 Cor. 10:16: to participate in the blood of Christ. Preuschen-Bauer thus leaves the question open: κοινωνία may denote communication or participation.

2

More attention perhaps should be bestowed on what Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament* has to say on this point. Of all the lexicographical works on the New Testament, Kittel's is the most thorough, most extensive, most modern, and most scholarly. Kittel clearly defends the old Melancthonian view of κοινωνία in the sense of communication. He writes among other things: "Κοινωνία, Abstraktbildung zu κοινωνός und κοινωνέω, bezeichnet die Teilhabe, Gemeinschaft, besonders im Sinn der engen Verbindung. Κοινωνία drueckt ein beiderseitiges Verhaeltnis aus. . . . Wie bei κοινωνέω kann dabei entweder mehr die gewaehrende oder die empfangende Seite der Gemeinschaft im Vordergrund stehen. Κοινωνία ist 1. Anteilhaben (participation), 2. Anteilgeben (communication) und 3. Gemeinschaft (communion).

It is interesting to note what Kittel writes in regard to the use of the term in connection with the participation of pagan worshipers in feasts dedicated to their gods. These temple feasts according to ancient popular opinion actually made the worshipers participants of their gods; or, in other words, the gods became their companions ("Mahl- und Tisch-

genossen") at the feasts. The *κοινωνία* of the sacrificial feasts thus established a most intimate fellowship between the worshiper and the god that he worshiped. The term then had a distinctive meaning, which Christianity later received, purified, and made actually true. Kittel thus seeks to furnish the background for a better understanding of the fact why the word *κοινωνία* should be used by the great missionary among the Greek heathen as frequently as he does. We may say: Just as pagan worship is a caricature of true worship, so also pagan communion fellowship is a caricature of true communion fellowship with Christ, our divine Lord, taking place in His Holy Supper.

We do not agree to everything that Kittel writes in the following paragraph, but we believe that it is helpful in understanding his view of 1 Cor. 10:16 ff. We read: "Paulus verwendet sodann hoechst bedeut-sam *κοινωνία* fuer die im Abendmahl entstehende Gemeinschaft. Das Teilhaben an Christus, das grundsatzlich und vollstaendig im Glauben erlebt wird, wird in gesteigerter Form—ohne dass eine dogmatische Abgleichung erfolgt—im Sakrament verwirklicht und erlebt [?], 1 Cor. 10:16 ff. Paulus stellt das Abendmahl zunaechst in eine Linie mit den juedischen und heidnischen Opfermahlzeiten [?]. Nach dem in der Antike allgemeinen Glauben [?] ist es ihm dabei eine Selbstverstaend-lichkeit, dass die Teilnehmer der Kultmahlzeit Genossen des Gottes werden. So werden die Teilnehmer an den juedischen Opfermahlen *κοινωνοί τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* (V.18), wobei *θυσιαστήριον* Deckwort [?] fuer Gott ist. Der Altar stellt die Gegenwart Gottes dar und verbuergt sie. Ebenso selbstverstaendlich werden ihm die Teilnehmer der heidnischen Kultmahle *κοινωνοί τῶν δαιμονίων* (V.20). Analog werden beim Abend-mahl die Teilnehmer Genossen Christi. Die hier ganz real entstehende Verbindung ergibt fuer den Christen die naturgemaesse religioese Folge-rung, Kultmahle fremder Gottheiten zu meiden (V.21). Der Art des Abendmahls entsprechend, wird von Paulus die Gemeinschaft mit der Person Christi in die Doppelaussage einer *κοινωνία* mit Leib und Blut Christi auseinandergelegt. . . . Brot und Wein sind dem Paulus Traeger der Gegenwart Christi, so wie der juedische Altar die Gegenwart Gottes verbuergt. Das Geniessen von Brot und Wein ist Zusammenschluss (Anteilschaft) mit dem himmlischen [?] Christus. Der erhoehte Christus ist dem Paulus mit dem irdisch-historischen identisch. *Κοινωνία* drueckt dabei eine innige Verbindung aus. Gerade das ist dem Paulus an der Feier wichtig. Selbstverstaendlich schliesst fuer Paulus die reale Ver-bindung mit dem Erhoehten auch das in seinem Tod gewonnene Gut der Suendenvergebung ein. Wie diese Vereinigung im Kultmahl zu-stande kommt, ist von Paulus weder fuer die Seite der daemonischen noch der Christugemeinschaft gesagt. Es kommt dem Paulus nicht auf die Art, sondern auf die Tatsache der engen Verbindung an. In dem zwischeneingefuegten Satz (V.17) spricht Paulus noch aus, dass es—ganz wie bei den Opfermahlen—auch beim Abendmahl zu einer Ver-bindung der Mahlgenossen untereinander kommt. Auch diese kommt nicht abseits von Christus, sondern in gleichzeitiger Verbundenheit mit ihm zustande, wie Christus ja in dem einen Brot dargestellt [?] ist."

We shall not take time to discuss certain details with which we might take issue in this paragraph; essentially Kittel's view here is

that of Zahn and, let us add, that of the Lutheran Church, inasmuch as he teaches that by receiving the Holy Supper we truly take part in our blessed Savior. Whether, however, this is done *ex opere operato* or by spiritual eating and drinking or because of any sacramental union the paragraph does not state; nor shall we treat these points at greater length, since they would lead us too far afield. We quoted the paragraph merely because it supports and clarifies Kittel's exposition of *κοινωνία* in the sense of *communicatio*. We may add here another paragraph from Kittel, because it supplements the thought just expressed. We read: "Die Christugemeinschaft fuehrt notwendig ueber in die Christengemeinschaft, die Gemeinschaft der Glieder untereinander. Auch hierfuer gebraucht Paulus in mehrfachen Beziehungen *κοινωνέω*, wobei das *Teilhaben* an den Bruedern dem Wortsinn von *κοινωνέω* entsprechend mehrfach in das *Teilgeben* uebergeht. . . . Als Leidensgenossen des Paulus werden ihm die Philipper zu Genossen seiner Gnade (Phil. 1:7), das heisst wohl der ihm von Gott zum Heil aufgelegten Leidensnot. Und Paulus dankt ihnen fuer die ihm in seiner Truebsal gewaehrte Teilnahme (4:14). Auch hier geht das fuehlende Teilnehmen in das taetig hilfreiche Anteilgeben ueber, wie Paulus an der Stelle ja den Dank fuer die empfangende Gabe ausspricht. Auch in Heb. 10:33, wo der Verfasser die Leser in solche einteilt, die (unmittelbar) die Verfolgung erlitten, und solche, die (mittelbar) zu Genossen der Dulder wurden, ist wohl an teilnehmende Gesinnung und hilfreiche Tat (Anteilgeben) gegenueber den Duldern gedacht."

Kittel thus defends the meaning of *κοινωνία* in the sense of communication, especially in the writings of St. Paul. As proofs he further mentions Phil. 4:15: Οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν (no church communicated with [to] me); Gal. 6:6: Κοινωνοίτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι (Let him that is taught in the Word communicate unto him that teacheth); Heb. 13:16 (not given by Kittel as Pauline): Τῆς δὲ εὐποιίας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπαλθάνεσθε (But of doing good and of communicating be not forgetful).

The question now confronting us is: How does the meaning of *κοινωνία* in the sense of communication agree textually and contextually with 1 Cor. 10:16 ff.? This matter indeed requires careful consideration.

3

First of all, let it be noted that the passage 1 Cor. 10:16 occurs in a severely hortatory portion of Paul's epistle. The general introductory warning to this passage is: "Flee from idolatry" (v. 15). That theme dominates everything in the *passus* up to v. 22. In presenting the warning to the Corinthians, the apostle appeals to the Christian discernment and judgment of the Corinthian believers (v. 15). The special point he makes is that the Christians at Corinth must not partake of the pagan sacrificial idol feasts, such especially as were held in the temples in honor of heathen gods (v. 21). To do so would provoke God to jealousy, i. e., punishment (v. 22). Properly speaking, verse 16 introduces Paul's reasoning against eating εἰδωλόθυτα in an idolatrous manner. (Under certain circumstances, Paul admits, εἰδωλόθυτα may be eaten

[v. 27].) Now, believers as such partake of the Sacrament of the Altar. But that is the *Lord's Supper*, since the wine has communion with the blood and the bread with the body (v. 16). By partaking of the bread (and, of course, also of the wine, a reference which the apostle omits) the believers become *one body* (v. 17), namely, the *spiritual body of Christ*. This is true, of course, since in the Lord's Supper through faith they are engrafted into Christ. In v. 17, then, Paul states his major premise: By partaking of the Lord's Supper believers become the one spiritual body of Christ, or are engrafted into Christ. The preceding verse (v. 16) leads up to this premise, or, we may say, it prepares the way for it. In v. 18 the apostle next illustrates the great truth stated in his major premise by an illustration from the Old Testament: the priests eating of the sacrifices offered on the altar thereby became especially joined to the Lord, because there was a certain communion between the sacrifices and the Lord. V. 18 thus supports the thought in v. 17: "By partaking of the Lord's Supper we become so intimately joined with the Lord as to be His spiritual body." But the same thing that happened in the case of the Old Testament priests who ate of the sacrifices happens (though in a different way) to the pagan Greeks who eat of idol sacrifices. Of course, idols are nothing (v. 19); they do not exist. But idol worship is devil worship (v. 20): Idolaters therefore actually have fellowship with the devils (v. 20). And now, this central point having been demonstrated and the major premise (v. 16) and the minor premise (v. 20) having been clearly and convincingly impressed, Paul comes with his impressive warning conclusion: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils..." (v. 21). His *facit* is: "Either . . . or! You cannot do both. Either you partake of the table of the Lord, or you partake of that of the devils. But both *cannot* (remember, he does not say *must not*) be done; for as soon as one partakes of, or joins himself to, the devils, he cannot partake of the Lord, or be truly joined to the Lord. Such is the apostle's striking, convincing argument, which today (among other things) we may apply especially to all unchristian and antichristian lodges. We believe that this is one of the most effective and telling syllogisms in the entire New Testament. But that thought belongs into another field. Just now we are interested in what bearing the apostle's ratiocination has on the meaning of the term *κοινωνία*.

4

To the proverbial casual observer the very context may appear to support Kittel's and Melancthon's definition of *κοινωνία* as an *Anteilgeben*, or *communication*; for just upon this very point the apostle's whole argument seems to hinge. But those who argue from the context that *κοινωνία* in v. 16 must mean *communication*, overlook the fact that v. 16 is only introductory and that the apostle's demonstration of the *effects* of partaking of the Lord's Supper begins only in v. 17. There first he states that by partaking of the Lord's Supper we become His spiritual body; and we do so for the obvious reason that the wine is the communion of the blood and the bread that of the body of Christ. Just so in the Old Testament the priests had communion with

the Lord by partaking of the sacrifices, because these sacrifices stood in intimate relation to the Lord: they were the *Lord's* sacrifices. And just so the pagan idolaters associated themselves with the devils, because the sacrifices offered by the heathen were offered to the devils and therefore stood in an intimate relation to them; they were *devils' sacrifices*.

It is not true, therefore, that the context forces us to take *κοινωνία* in v.16 in the sense of *communication*. On the contrary, the context, or rather the close reasoning of the apostle, step by step, demands that we take *κοινωνία* in that meaning which it has originally, both because of its etymology and its *usus loquendi*, namely: *communion*, or *participation*, both of which practically mean the same thing.

From a close study of all passages in which *κοινωνία* occurs, it is obvious that, whenever the word *κοινωνία* is used in an active sense, it is used in a figurative or wider meaning, which also Kittel's remarks on the point suggest. In fact, even in such cases the original meaning of *κοινωνία*, as communion or participation, can well be traced. Thus *κοινωνία* is called a collection (2 Cor.8:4); it is so called because by contributing to the needs of the saints Christians have fellowship with one another; for which reason both the Authorized and the British Revised Version translate the expression at this place with "fellowship of (in) the ministering to the saints." The same is true of all the other passages which Kittel quotes for *κοινωνέω* in the sense of *jemand Anteil geben an etwas*, to let anyone share in something (e.g., Phil.4:15; Gal.6:6; 2 Cor.9:13 [Authorized Version: "your liberal distribution"; British Revised Version: "the liberality of your contribution"]; Heb. 13:16. In all these passages the *Grundbedeutung*, i. e., the underlying sense, is that of *participation*, or *communion*.

5

The long and short of it is that in spite of all that modern and ancient scholars have written on behalf of the meaning *communication*, we cannot become convinced that we should revise the current translation *communion* and *Gemeinschaft* in 1 Cor.10:16 to *communication* and *Anteilgeben*. In the first place, the meaning *communion* or *participation* of *κοινωνία* is the etymological and historical meaning of this much-used term; any other connotation is exceptional and figurative. In the second place, hermeneutical common sense compels us to adhere to the current meaning of the term, unless the text and context force us for stringent causes to depart from it, which in this instance is certainly not the case. In the third place, to translate *κοινωνία* in v.16 with *communication* means to anticipate the apostle's argument in v.17 and to misunderstand his entire argumentation in the whole *passus*. In the fourth place, the translation *communication* no doubt proceeded from Melancthon's eagerness to contradict Calvinistic exegetes; but, by a strange irony of fate, some of his very opponents took up his suggestion and proved from it their own erroneous view of the Lord's Supper. In the same way, Romanistic theologians found ground in 1 Cor.10:16 for their *ex opere operato* doctrine. Lutheranism, in fact, does not gain anything by Melancthon's translation *communication*,

but loses very much for its Scriptural doctrine of the real presence. In the fifth place, most Lutheran exegetes who take *κοινωνία* in 1 Cor. 10:16 in the sense of *communication*, put into the term a double meaning: *communion plus communication* (even Kittel is no exception), thus overthrowing the hermeneutical rule that *sensus literalis unus est*. Zahn's commentary, which we have found correct in so many things touching on linguistic problems, is right also with regard to the one under consideration: "Dass in jener heiligen Handlung an Kelch und Brot eine objektive Wirkung im Sinn realer Anteilnahme an Christi Leib und Blut sich knuepfe, betont danach das Ganze." We would say: "erklaert und betont Vers 17"; though we accept "das Ganze" in the sense that from v.17 to 21 the apostle urges the effect of the Lord's Supper on the Christian believer. And let us remember: in this passage the apostle does not argue that also unbelievers receive the true body and blood of Christ, as he does in 1 Cor. 11:27 ff., but he treats the problem *from the viewpoint of the Christian believer*. Let us, then, say it again: There is nothing in the text or context of 1 Cor. 10:16 that compels us to take the term *κοινωνία* in the sense of *communication*, or *id, per quod communio fit*. We admit that in a few exceptional passages *κοινωνία* may mean *communication*, though the background of communion or fellowship remains also in these passages; but to translate 1 Cor. 10:16 thus: "The cup of blessing . . . is it not the communication of the blood of Christ?" is decidedly unwarranted and confuses the sequence of thought in this passage. It is a translation which goes too far and therefore does not go at all.

6

It may interest our readers to hear what Luther, the greatest of all exegetes in the New Testament, has to say on this passage, on which he wrote very extensively against the Reformed. It is from this controversial point of view that we must understand Luther's often misunderstood *modus loquendi*. Perhaps Dr. F. Pieper, the great and thorough student of Luther, may best clear up the Reformer's view for us before we quote Brother Martin himself. In his monumental work *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. III, p. 400, he treats Luther's view on *κοινωνία* in an important footnote. Dr. Pieper himself rejects the translation of *κοινωνία* with *communication*, clinging closely to the textual reading that there is a communion (*Gemeinschaft*) between the wine and the blood and between the bread and the body. He writes: "Der Apostel schaeft, wie wir oben bereits in einem andern Zusammenhang sahen, den Korinthern, die leichtfertig mit dem Abendmahl umgingen, sehr nachdruecklich ein, dass fuer die Teilnehmer am Abendmahl der gesegnete Kelch 'die Gemeinschaft (*κοινωνία*) des Blutes Christi' und das gebrochene Brot 'die Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi' sei." (Vol. III, p. 400.) Then he goes on to say in footnote No. 1293: "Die erste Bedeutung von *κοινωνία* ist natuerlich 'Gemeinschaft' (*communio*). Ob es im Neuen Testament auch 'Mitteilung' (*communicatio*) bedeuten kann, was die einen bejahen (Ebeling), die andern verneinen (Cremer), braucht hier nicht untersucht zu werden. Hier ist es jedenfalls 'Gemeinschaft,' wie Luther uebersetzt hat. Das fordert der Kontext. [Italics ours.]

Wie durch die Teilnahme an den Opfermahlen der Heiden die Gemeinschaft mit den Daemonen vorhanden ist, so ist durch den Genuss des Abendmahlskelchs Gemeinschaft mit dem Blut Christi vorhanden. Unrichtig bemerkt Meyer zu 1 Kor. 10:16, dass Luther *κοινωνία* nicht als 'Gemeinschaft,' sondern als 'Mitteilung' fasse. Wo Luther *κοινωνία* uebersetzt, fasst er *κοινωνία* als 'Gemeinschaft,' wie seine Bibeluebersetzung und z. B. XX, 236 beweist. Dass er bei der Darlegung des Sinnes der Stelle auch von der Mitteilung des Leibes Christi redet, kommt daher, dass, wer an der *communio corporis* festhaelt, damit auch die *communicatio corporis* lehrt. Ist fuer alle am Mahl des Herrn Teilnehmenden, fuer Wuerdige und Unwuerdige, das Brot die Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi, so wird natuerlich durch das Brot der Leib Christi mitgeteilt." Dr. Pieper's argument is unanswerable and reproduces Luther's view of the *κοινωνία* exactly.

Let us consider, for example, the passage in Luther referred to by Dr. Pieper in Vol. XX, 236 f. Here Luther writes: "Merk zum drittenmal, dass er helle und klar heraus sagt: 'Dasselbige Brot, welches wir brechen, ist die Gemeinschaft des Leibs Christi.' Hoerst du, mein lieber Bruder? Das gebrochene oder mit Stuecken mitgeteilte Brot ist die Gemeinschaft des Leibs Christi; *es ist, es ist, es ist* (sagt er) *die Gemeinschaft des Leibs Christi.*" Here Luther clearly defends the translation: "The bread is the communion of the body." But then he draws the conclusion from this communion by saying: "Was ist [what follows from] die Gemeinschaft aber des Leibs Christi? Es mag nicht anders sein, denn dass diejenigen, so das gebrochene Brot, ein jeglicher sein Stueck, nehmen, in demselbigen den Leib Christi nehmen. Dass diese Gemeinschaft sei soviel als teilhaftig sein, dass den gemeinen Leib Christi ein jeglicher mit dem andern empfaehet, wie er daselbst [1 Kor. 10:17] sagt: 'Wir sind alle *ein* Leib, die wir *eines* Brots teilhaftig sind. Daher es auch von alters her *communio* heisst, das ist, Gemeinschaft."

Let us note what Luther in this passage infers from the fact that the bread is the communion of the body and the wine the communion of the blood of our Lord. Since the bread is the communion of the body and the wine the communion of the blood, it follows that every communicant, worthy and unworthy, receives in, with and under the bread and wine the true body and blood of Christ; and this conclusion he draws on the basis of 1 Cor. 10:17, where this very fact is clearly stated. On page 1088 of Volume XX Luther argues thus: "Darum muss vonnoeten der rechte, wahre Leib Christi leiblich im Brot sein, das wir brechen, dass sein die Unwuerdigen gleich geniessen moegen, weil sie sein geistlich nicht geniessen, wie dieser Spruch Pauli lautet: 'Das Brot, das wir brechen, ist die Gemeinschaft,' das ist, der gemeine Leib Christi, unter die geteilt, so das gebrochene Brot empfaehen." Luther's argumentation, of course, is always directed against the Reformed, who deny the real presence, the sacramental union, and the oral manducation, teaching in its stead only the spiritual reception. Against the Reformed spiritual eating and drinking (by faith) he again and again stresses the thought: "Es kann hie an diesem Ort nicht heissen die Gemeinschaft des Glaubens im Herzen; denn der Text redet hier von solchem gemeinen Gut, das man empfaehen und geniessen soll, als da ist das Brot

und Becher. Denn er spricht: 'das Brot, das wir brechen, der Becher, den wir segnen,' und hernach: 'Wir alle sind ein Leib, die wir von einem Brot und einem Becher teilhaftig sind' usw. [1 Kor. 10:17.] So ist nun gewiss, dass *κοινωνία*, die Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi, ist nichts anderes denn der Leib Christi als ein gemein Gut, unter viele ausgeteilt und gegeben zu geniessen." (P.1087.) Dr. Pieper thus is right in maintaining that Luther translates *κοινωνία* with *communion*, but infers from this *communion* (on the basis of 1 Cor. 10:17) the real presence and sacramental eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ.

After all is said, therefore, the ancient translation of *κοινωνία*, current in our common versions, such as the Authorized and Luther's, is the preferable one, indeed the only one that fully agrees with the etymological meaning of the term, its *usus loquendi*, and the sequence of thought in the passage 1 Cor. 10:14-22. What 1 Cor. 10:16 really says is just this: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the *communion* of the body of Christ?"

But no matter whether we take *κοινωνία* in the sense of *communion* or *communication*, the Reformed will always employ the passage to defend their error of the *manducatio spiritualis* and their denial of the real presence. Thus Dr. A. T. Robertson (*Word Pictures*, IV, pp. 154, 155) writes: "Literally [*κοινωνία* means] a *participation*. . . . It is, of course, a *spiritual participation* in the blood of Christ, which is symbolized by the cup." On the other hand, our readers remember the complaint of our Formula of Concord (*Triglot*, Art. VII, p. 993): "We are justly astonished that some are so bold as to venture now to cite this passage [1 Cor. 10:16] which they themselves previously opposed to the Sacramentarians, as a foundation of their error that in the Supper the body of Christ is partaken of spiritually only. [For thus they speak]: The bread is the communication [*communicatio*] of the body of Christ, that is, it is that by which we have fellowship with the body of Christ, which is the Church, or it is the means by which we believers are united with Christ, just as the Word of the Gospel, apprehended by faith, is a means through which we are spiritually united to Christ and incorporated into the body of Christ, which is the Church." The translation of *κοινωνία*, therefore, in the sense of *communication* does not help the Lutheran exegetes a whit in defending the Scriptural doctrine of the real presence. On the other hand, the ancient and current translation *communion* throws upon the Reformed opponents a burden of proof which even by their most subtle reasoning they cannot supply without violating the text.

NOTE. — The question has been asked whether 1 Cor. 10:16 can rightly be used at all as a proof text for the real presence. Those who have raised the question argue thus: "Since in v. 18 the apostle asserts a communion between the partakers of sacrifices and the Old Testament altar, as also between the partakers of the heathen sacrifices and the devils (v. 20), there cannot be predicated a real presence in v. 16, since certainly there is no real presence predicated in vv. 18 and 20, which illustrate v. 16." Or, considering the point from its positive side: "If a real

presence is taught in v.16, a real presence must be taught also in vv.18 and 20." But those who reason in this way, forget that an illustration agrees with the thing illustrated only in the point of comparison (*tertium comparationis*). Thus in Deut.18:15 the prophecy of Moses that "the Lord, thy God, will raise up unto thee a Prophet . . . like unto me," has for its point of comparison only the fact that Christ, like Moses, was a prophet (κατ' ἐξοχήν) *proclaiming God's Word and therefore demanding obedience* ("unto Him ye shall hearken"). No one, therefore, dare conclude from Deut.18:16 that Christ (being like Moses) is a mere man or, again, that, as Christ, so also Moses was the Son of God; but the illustration must not be used beyond its *tertium comparationis*. Furthermore, in John 17:11 Jesus prays His heavenly Father that the disciples "may be one as We are." From this passage we dare not infer that as the three persons in the Godhead form an essential unity (*una numero essentia*), so in Christ also the believers and God form an essential unity (pantheism), but the *tertium comparationis* is no more than the *unio mystica*, the thought being a *maiore ad minus*. So also we must consider 1 Cor.10:16, where St.Paul expressly supports the doctrine of the real presence (cf. 1 Cor.11:27 ff.), taught so clearly in the words of institution, by saying very definitely that there is a communion between the bread and the body and the cup and the blood. However, he does not so speak in vv.18 and 20, for there he merely says that those eating the sacrifices are partakers (κοινωνοί) of the altar and that those eating εἰδωλόθυτα are partakers (κοινωνούς) of devils. The very reading of these verses proves that the apostle, while illustrating the real presence and oral reception in the Holy Supper, does not place on the same level with the Holy Supper the two similarities which he employs for the purpose of illustration. Certainly, no one would be so utterly foolish as to predicate a real presence and an oral manducation at the Old Testament sacrifice-eating or at the New Testament pagan εἰδωλόθυτα-eating! Manifestly those who argue as we showed above, prove too much and thus do not prove anything. Not every communion is of the same kind. There is a sacramental communion, and there is, for instance, a communion of prayer and worship. Other communions may illustrate the sacramental communion, but are not parallel to it, the sacramental union being unique. We may illustrate Christ's sacrifice on the cross by the sacrifices of the Old Testament; but Christ's redemptive sacrifice nevertheless was unique, that is to say, the only one of its kind or without equal. The same difference holds between the "communion" in 1 Cor.10:16 and that in v.18 and in v.20.

J. THEODORE MUELLER



Theological Observer — *ദിവിന-സമയസമീപി*

The Lutheran Message Brought to Central America. — From Honduras of Central America a missionary of the Evangelical Reformed Church, Mr. Harold N. Auler, sent an interesting letter reporting on the invasion of that state by the Lutheran Hour broadcast. Writing to the office of the Lutheran Hour, he reports thus: "In January I had an opportunity to visit Tegucigalpa, the capital of this republic, and received some interesting information regarding your broadcasts. Believing this information to be of interest as well as value to you, I am taking this means of passing it on to you.

"The Central Plaza or Parque Central, as the block-square park is called in Tegucigalpa, has facing it the Cathedral of Tegucigalpa, a Roman Catholic church. An old building of the Spanish colonial time and type, it is a stately edifice but, of course, means little in the spiritual life of the people. We went to the mass to investigate things on January 6 and found 80 women and children and two men in the cathedral. The Festival of the Three Kings is important, and one would expect a large crowd. To the other side of the plaza, not in front of the Cathedral but to its left, is the National Museum, and next to it are two loud-speakers of the Tegucigalpa Radio Station HRN. To the right of the Cathedral is the City Hall and a hotel; the other side of the plaza is flanked by stores. The plaza has cement benches and is beautified with trees and bushes. Every night the benches and walks are well occupied by people who go to hear the programs over Station HRN. On certain occasions your station is heard all over the plaza and even in the cathedral over the Tegucigalpa Radio HRN. One of our missionaries spent several months in the capital and stated that on several occasions he sat in the park to enjoy the Lutheran Hour. Remembering the fact that this is a Roman Catholic country and that the broadcasters are just to the side (say 150 feet) of the Cathedral, one must feel grateful that the pure Gospel is thus heard from your station. We heard that objections were made but were overruled.

"In December the twin city of Tegucigalpa — called Comayagua — celebrated its annual festival of Feria de Comayagua. It is a civic-religious celebration. There, too, loud-speakers were put up in the midst of the booths, and your Lutheran Hour was heard in a Roman Catholic city and festival."

God be praised for this progress of the message of justification by grace through faith. At once the words of Ps. 110:2 come to one's mind, "Rule Thou in the midst of Thine enemies." A.

The U. L. C. A. and Sectarian Protestantism. — When the executive board of the U. L. C. A. met in January, among the subjects it considered was the relation which the U. L. C. A. sustains with the World Council of Churches and with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. "Also under consideration," so the *Lutheran* of January 28 reports, "is a proposition which originated in Atlantic City recently to merge into one organization several agencies of interdenominational

co-operation, such as the Foreign Missions Council, the Home Missions Conference, the Educational Conference, and some of their major subdivisions." As to action taken by the executive board, the *Lutheran* states, "Snap decisions are not contemplated by the executive board. Instead, special committees have been designated that are charged to gather information and arrange meetings through which all U. L. C. A. agencies concerned in interdenominational co-operation can bring experience and principles to bear upon effective conclusions. Doubtless our coming convention at Louisville next October will receive reports and determine lines of action in so far as the U. L. C. A. is concerned."

One of the criticisms which conservative Lutherans have voiced against the U. L. C. A. is that it follows a unionistic course. The above report substantiates the charge. If the U. L. C. A. maintained its consultative relations with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in order to tell this organization, permeated as it is with Modernism and with gross indifference to matters of doctrine, of the wrath of God which is enkindled by disloyalty to the revealed truth and to rescue from the burning ship what still can be brought into safety, one might find it possible to justify such membership. If that were the situation, we might be willing to find a parallel in the course of the Lutherans preparing in 1537 to attend a general council convoked by the Pope, adverted to by Luther in his preface to the Smalcald Articles. But unfortunately, as far as our information goes, such is by no means the role which the U. L. C. A. has chosen for itself in joining the Federal Council of Churches indirectly through a consultative membership. Its position is not that of a zealous witness of the truth, but of a friend of Modernism-riddled denominations. There are sectarian churches whose members revolt against the thought of belonging to this faith-denying Federal Council, and the large U. L. C. A. does not possess the courage to say "No" when the invitation to belong to the Council is presented. The same judgment, we fear, must be voiced with respect to the membership of the U. L. C. A. in the World Council of Churches. It is the failure to be a salt, to testify, which we find iniquitous. Besides, of course, we have to point to the disregard of the warning of the Scriptures against the virus of false doctrine which is evident in this case. There is, moreover, the fellowshiping of outspoken errorists. If the U. L. C. A. identifies itself with organizations in which the truth is trampled on, it cannot complain when conservative Lutherans charge it with disloyalty to the Scriptures. A.

The New Archbishop of Canterbury a Reed Shaken by the Wind?—Writing about the new primate of the Church of England, the editor of the *Presbyterian* says in an editorial, "Dr. Wm. Temple is widely known in this country. A few years ago he traveled in the United States and was entertained at many places. He was a guest for a time in Presbyterian groups at Princeton and elsewhere. Dr. Temple has a robust personality as well as physique. In connection with his recent selection as Archbishop of Canterbury, we think it proper to quote a paragraph which he wrote on October 1, 1937, as chairman of the Church of England Commission on Education, appointed in 1922. Dealing with divergent doctrinal views expressed in different parts of the report,

Dr. Temple declared in the introduction, 'In view of my own responsibility in the Church, I think it right to affirm here that I wholeheartedly accept as historical facts the birth of our Lord from a virgin mother and the resurrection of His physical body from death and the tomb. I anticipate, though with less assurance, that these events will appear to be intrinsically bound up with His deity when the relations between the spiritual and physical elements in our nature are more completely understood. But I fully recognize the position of those who sincerely affirm the reality of our Lord's incarnation without accepting one or both of these two events as actual historical occurrences, regarding the records rather as parables than as history, a presentation of spiritual truth in narrative form.' (See Report, p. 12.) Here in a few words from Dr. Temple himself we believe one finds a good thumbnail picture of the new Archbishop of Canterbury. We are told that the Church of England is rapidly losing ground. We do not find much reason for hope that under this new administration the tide will be turned. The elevation of Dr. Temple causes no surprise. It is typically English, middling, and obvious; the choice might have been far worse, and it might possibly have been better. We shall see." Evidently the new Archbishop of Canterbury would not hesitate to sign the iniquitous Auburn Affirmation which declares that on the doctrines of verbal inspiration, the virgin birth of Jesus, his bodily resurrection, the substitutionary atonement, and the historical reality of His miracles, one may disagree with the historic Christian position without injury to one's faith. May God have mercy on the Church of England under this Laodicean leadership!

A.

Is War Sin? — *The Calvin Forum*, while discussing the anti-Scriptural and antidemocratic attitude of modernistic pacifism, considers also the question whether war is sin.

We read: "From time to time one can read the statement in the religious press that war is sin. That is, of course, quite in harmony with the perverted pacifistic teaching to which many sectors of the Christian Church have in recent years been exposed. An ardent Dutch pacifist, himself a professor of liberal theology, some years ago characterized his indictment of all war with the expressive title, 'De Zondeval van het Menschengeslacht' (*"The Fall of Man"* — *"Der Suendenfall des Menschengeschlechts"*). With their blind optimism as to the inherent goodness of human nature these 'liberals' first deny the reality of sin and the historicity of the Fall in the Biblical sense, and then they brand all taking of arms as the essence of human sin and the Fall. But not only is this thesis 'War is sin' part of the moral — or rather, immoral — furniture of the pacifists. There seem also to be some good Christian people, not infected with the poison of pacifism, who do not at once detect the moral fallacy in this proposition. 'War is sin' possibly appears a bit plausible when people think of the fact that there would be no war in the world without sin. But there is a great difference between holding — as we all do — that war is a result of sin, and affirming that war is sin. 'War is sin' means that anyone participating in war is sinning. And this is a great fallacy. The root error underlying this sort of judgment is its failure to distinguish between those who

by unprovoked aggression foist death and destruction upon others and those who in the course of their plain patriotic and Christian duty are called to protect their home and country against the assaults of such aggressors. Participation in the same war may be a sin for one person and a solemn duty for another. In the words of General MacArthur quoted above: 'I am surprised that men with clear and logical minds confuse defensive warfare with the disease which it alone can cure when all other remedies have failed.' The sweeping statement that war is sin cannot be harmonized with Scriptural, Christian teaching. War may be a sin for one nation and a solemn God-given duty for another. Only recently a Methodist bishop of the Middle West issued a statement for the benefit of the 763 ministers under his jurisdiction which, though it apparently was clearly antipacifistic, contained this fallacious sentence: 'I am sure war cannot be accepted as a Christian practice and receive the blessing of the Church.' It is quite possible that the bishop had not quite succeeded in purging his own sentences of the left-overs of a pacifistic leaven which used to permeate the whole lump until recently. It is well also for converted pacifists to speak in unambiguous terms. The new age upon which we are entering may be the age of the paradox, but I am sure it is not an age that will have much patience with the ambiguous use—or rather, misuse—of language to which an effete, unrealistic 'liberalism' has been treating its devotees for some decades. These are days in which to call a spade a spade."

The Modernistic rebellious attitude toward God's Word results in a rebellious attitude also toward lawful government and its rightful authority. In addition, Modernism must have a "talking point." Since it no longer recognizes sin in the Biblical sense, it declares something to be a sin which Scripture does not teach to be sinful at all, just to have something to say and something that sounds plausible and appealing, and, let us add, something with which to impress the people. The distinction between "war as a result of sin" and "war as sin essentially," which *The Calvin Forum* makes, is, as we believe, very helpful in clarifying the issue.

J. T. M.

Brief Items.—Speaking of the book of sermons by Dr. Fosdick "Living under Tension," the *British Weekly*, after some words of praise, says of the sermons: "Their weakness lies in their theology, or want of theology. We are reminded when handling this book of the remark of a friend: 'When I shake a man by the hand, I like to feel his bones.' It is not easy to feel the bones of firm theological thinking beneath all this artistic fleshing. He is afraid of dogma." Dr. Zwemer, in reporting the above in the *Presbyterian*, adds, "From quite another quarter comes a similar note: 'It is not more ethics that we need, but a more vertebrate creed.'" Our slogan must be, No dogmaphobia!

The *Christian Century* states that a union Lenten service was held in St. Mark's-in-the-Bouwerie. The clergymen that officiated were two Episcopalians, one Presbyterian, and a Lutheran, the Rev. Otto H. Bostrom, pastor of Gustavus Adolphus Lutheran Church. Supposing that this report is correct, we inquire, Why must such scandalous things happen?

A.

 Book Review — Literatur

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

A Study of the Passion of Christ. By A. Fibiger. The History of the Sufferings and Death of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, translated by Olaf Lysnes. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. 293 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$2.00.

We are glad to draw attention to this book on the suffering of our Savior. The author is a citizen of Denmark, where he was a leader of the Home Missionary Movement. The translation into English, as far as we are able to judge, has been well done. "The book is divided into short chapters—about as many as there are days in Lent—in order that one may, if he wishes, read one meditation each day, and thus follow our Lord on His way of suffering" (Foreword). We think that no minister who buys this book will be disappointed. The various events which are brought before us in the history of the Savior's passion are discussed one after the other so that one here has a commentary of these vital chapters in the history of our Lord's life. The author makes no attempt at grandiose oratory. What strikes us as particularly favorable is the wealth of quotations and illustrations which one meets here. The literature of the world is at times drawn on to lend emphasis to a statement. The author endeavors to be practical and frequently dwells on problems that one meets in everyday life. Our readers will welcome a paragraph.

Speaking of the responsibility of Judas, Fibiger says (p. 143), "Henrick Ibsen, the Norwegian sphinx, who loved to struggle with lies in life and the puzzles in life, has, of course, to tackle this, too. In his book *Emperor and Galilean* there is a conversation between the mystic Maximos and Julian the Apostate. First, Cain is conjured up and then Judas, 'a red-whiskered man with torn clothes and a rope around his neck.' Julian extends his hand to keep him away and says in a low tone: 'No nearer! No nearer!' Then he asks: 'What were you in life?' The voice answers: 'The twelfth wheel of the world's wagon.' 'The twelfth? Even the fifth is counted as useless.' The voice: 'Where would the wagon have rolled to without me?' Julian: 'Where did it roll to with you?' 'Into glorification.' 'Why did you leap?' 'Because I willed to.' 'What did you will?' 'What I had to will.' 'Who chose you?' 'The Master.' 'Did the Master have foreknowledge when He chose you?' The voice: 'Well, that is the puzzle.' Further than that we apparently cannot get. The mystery that remains here no one of us can solve. It must be explained in the light of wisdom and righteousness of the almighty Savior. And we gain nothing by speculating about it. And still less by complaining."

We ought to quote here, too, what the author says on the nature of Christ's being forsaken by God. Having spoken of the Savior's physical suffering, he says (p. 233): "And yet—all this was as nothing

compared to the anguish of soul that He suffered when in these three hours He went into the great darkness and was separated from God. Then was Jesus in hell for us. For what is it to be in hell? It is to be where God is not. That is hell, and that is the worst pain and torment of hell: being eternally forsaken by God."

We wish we could close our review here. Unfortunately, from the doctrinal point of view the book has one serious defect which we have noticed. When the institution of the Lord's Supper is discussed (p.31), Ricard is quoted as saying, "A shadow of the cross falls on the supper table with its lighted candles. Suddenly everything He sees before Him becomes pictures of what is to come. The dull red wine in the cup makes Him think of His own red blood. The white unleavened bread He breaks, is it not as though it might be His own holy body delivered up to death?" Then Fibiger adds, "There is neither time nor place here to consider more in detail what the Holy Supper gives and accomplishes." The four points which he enumerates do not contain mention of the Real Presence. It seems that the author wishes to reject this doctrine. Why has he not a word of criticism for the bald, rationalistic remarks of Ricard? Why does he not briefly tell us about the glorious mystery of this heavenly meal?

With respect to matters of history and archaeology, we doubt that the author (or the translator) is always accurate enough. Cf. the statement (p.14) concerning Maundy Thursday: "On this day the Jews took their first bath after putting on sackcloth and ashes on Ash Wednesday, the first day of Lent." Another baffling sentence (p.14) pertains to the time that the Passover was instituted, "The month was then called Abib (an ear of corn), as autumn [?] was near, but after the time of the Babylonian captivity it was also called Nisan, and from this month Israel counted the beginning of their sacred year." Here somebody has blundered.

W. ARNDT

A New Heaven and a New Earth. By Edwin Lewis, Professor in Drew Theological Seminary. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York and Nashville. 248 pages, 5½×7. Price, \$2.00.

What this somewhat fanciful title means is explained on page 31: "The heaven makes the earth. According to what men esteem the 'high,' so will they deal with the 'low.' No people can be other than its gods." Applied to Christianity, it means: "What can the Christian, for whom God is Love and the world his good creation and life his gift and Jesus Christ his revealing and redeeming Word to men—what can the Christian do if not say, 'I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth . . . I am debtor?'" (P. 32.) It is most certainly true that the knowledge of God's love, of the forgiveness of sins effected by the vicarious death of Jesus Christ, transforms the believer's life, that "there is suffering love on the earth because there is suffering love in heaven" (p.56), that, applying the terminology of the title, "by the spirit of humility, by the spirit of self-forgetting service, 'the new earth' must come to pass" (p.156). But this blessed result will be obtained only where the Biblical, the true teaching of the Atonement is presented. And our book does not do that. It

speaks of "Jesus Christ, God's revealing and redeeming Word to men," it speaks of Jesus Christ as "the vicarious Sufferer" (p.142), but it does that in this wise: "By the power of an insight whose source we can only surmise, Jesus took the Second Isaiah's description of the Suffering Servant of God and then said: 'He is I; I am He.' Even if the somewhat common claim be true that in the thought of the original writer the Suffering Servant was not Messiah, that cannot destroy Jesus' right to have made it so. Actually it only accentuates the sheer spiritual audacity of His insight. If Jesus made out of the Suffering Servant what nobody else had ever made out of Him — Messiah; and if in the overpowering description of One who suffered for sins not His own He saw the principle of the world's redemption, and that in whose light every man must be finally judged; and if, having already identified Himself with the Son of Man in His aspect of Judge, He now identifies Himself with the Messiah in this His aspect of humiliation; and if, in this twofold identification, the profoundest spiritual insights of the most profoundly spiritual minds of the past are brought to sharp focus — if this be the case, then we can only say that in Jesus we are confronted with a disclosure of the absolute law of human salvation." (P.142.) Such a description of "vicarious suffering" will certainly give no man the knowledge of the blessed truth that God imputed the world's sins to Jesus, who wiped them out with His blood. And no man will conceive of the grace of God as absolutely free when he reads: "The kingdom of God is not a human achievement but a divine gift, although it is a gift only upon conditions which men must themselves fulfil. . . . What only God can make possible will be made possible, to be at once appropriated by men who will meet its conditions." (Pp.101,168.)

One need not be surprised at Dr. Lewis' failure to grasp the Biblical teaching on the Atonement, seeing that he does not recognize Jesus as the absolutely perfect Teacher nor Scripture as the inspired Word of God. See the quotation from page 142 and add this: "That Jesus Himself accepted the [apocalyptic] view along with His acceptance of much else of the thought of His time is evident all through the Gospels. . . . We have seen the astonishing way in which Jesus achieved His own emancipation from tradition. We need not hesitate to say that Jesus came slowly to this truth. Jesus at last arrived at His conviction respecting the cross." On Scripture: "If only we could disentangle the essential mind of Christ from the wrappings in which it came to us! . . . What Jesus 'demonstrably' said or believed must always remain a question. Matthew describes the crucifixion as attended by the portents required by the tradition. How could He be the Son of Man and all the proper 'signs' be absent? Compare the supposition with the fourth Gospel, and one begins to appreciate the extent of the emancipation which John had experienced. . . . The words, 'the Son of God' are not found in some of the best ancient manuscripts of the Gospel (Mark 1:1). In any event, the words would represent the judgment of the Church at a period later than the lifetime of Jesus."

Dr. Lewis has the right to use "the term 'heaven' in a more or less metaphorical sense" (p.11). But we have the right to ask him what

heaven in the literal sense means. All he has to say on this point is contained in these two statements: "We are not concerned — at least not at present — with what may be awaiting us at the end of the journey. This is traditionally what heaven is supposed to be if the journey has been as it should. . . . Whatever heaven there may be at the end of the journey will depend upon the sort of heaven from which the journey sets out." (P. 11.) "Then 'why stand ye looking into heaven?' As this Jesus you look for went, so shall He return. But how did He go? In the nature of the case, 'in a spiritual manner.' Literally, heaven is not *up there*. Heaven is wherever the spirit of Christ is in complete possession." (P. 177.) It certainly will not do to dismiss "heaven," our final home, with these few remarks. The less so as Dr. Lewis definitely denies the second coming of Christ as presented in Scripture. "There is to be no second coming in the sense usually understood; no turning of the sun into darkness; no opening of the graves that the dead might come forth; no Great Assize for the separation and judgment of men. . . ." "What is known as the second coming of Christ seemed to have warrant in Jesus' own words. Even Paul gave it up only slowly, if, indeed, he did not continue to cherish it to the end." "John is recovering the fact that the coming of the Son of Man, the glorification of the Son of Man, the judgment of the world, the casting out of Satan has happened already." (Pp. 163, 152, 161.) Our book takes no notice of the fact that this same John also records and believes the words of Jesus: "The hour is coming, etc." (John 5:28 f.)

Our book takes issue with humanism, ultra-radical liberalism. "The whole tendency of modern humanism has been in the direction of de-throning God and enthroning man. . . . God the Father has been cast out of heaven. . . . Jesus Christ has been cast out of heaven. . . . The denial of the Incarnation is the casting of Jesus Christ out of heaven!" (P. 212 ff.) Dr. Lewis is right in asking these humanists: "Is the impoverishing of heaven the way to enrich the earth?" And that applies to all and any impoverishing of the heavenly doctrine. TH. ENGELDER

The Nature of the Early Church. By Ernest F. Scott, D.D. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. 245 pages, 5½×8.

We opened this book with a sense of keen expectation, being familiar, in a measure, with the possibilities of the topic presented in the title; but we closed the book with an even greater sense of disappointment. It is a pity that men presume to write on any topic connected with the history of the primitive Church without wholeheartedly subscribing to the doctrine of inspiration. This is the first defect of the book, namely, that the author weakens his statements time and again by his uncertainty concerning the inspired account. He says of Luke's account in the Book of Acts: "He has also woven into his narrative a number of reminiscences which had come down from various channels and sometimes had been colored and worn out of shape in the process." (P. 7.) Of the passage Matt. 16:16-19 he blandly states: "As it stands, it is more than suspicious. Mark, on whom Matthew is dependent throughout the chapter [?], knows nothing of this addition." (P. 25.) On page 39 the author states

that Jesus was mistaken in His eschatological concepts. On page after page we were compelled to place queries on the margin because the arguments of the author are vitiated by his subjective attitude toward the inspired account. His is an attempt at a philosophy of church history which lacks the solid foundation of Scripture truth. Thus the kingdom concept of the author is muddled and inadequate because he does not distinguish between the essence of the Kingdom, as explained both by Jesus and Saint Paul in their well-known definitions, and the outward manifestation of the kingdom in the work of corporate church bodies. He speaks of the phenomenon of *glossolalia* (p.78), but it is certain that much more satisfactory answers have been found to explain both the Pentecost miracle and the strange speaking with tongues perhaps peculiar to certain sections of the Church, e.g., the Corinthian congregation. The author's attempt at explaining the introduction of Sunday fails badly since he does not use the pertinent Scripture texts and apparently thinks only of the Jewish background in the early Church, whereas we know that the Gospel was established at an early date in heathen centers, with little or no synagog antecedents. Throughout the book we received the impression that the author has nothing positive and constructive to offer anyone who regards the Scripture as the verbally inspired Word of God.

P. E. KRETZMANN

The Preacher's Manual. A Study in Homiletics with the Addition of a Brief History of Preaching, Sermon Material, Texts for Various Occasions, and Pericopic Systems. By John H. C. Fritz, D. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. IX and 390 pages, 9x6. Price, \$3.00 net.

The author of the *Preacher's Manual* is exceptionally well qualified to speak or write on problems of the practical ministry. As pastor, synodical official, dean of students at Concordia Seminary, and professor of Homiletics, Dr. Fritz has gained wide experience in the field of pastoral theology. A little over twenty years ago he published the *Practical Missionary*, in a sense an epoch-making booklet. It gave the present reviewer a new concept of the obligations and the opportunities of the ministry, and we dare say that it helped in a large measure to shape the present mission policy of our Synod. A few years ago Dr. Fritz rendered a real service to our ministry by publishing his *Pastoral Theology*. His ability to present clearly and concisely the Scriptural principles in questions of casuistry has undoubtedly helped many a pastor to solve the peculiar problems which arise in congregational life. Dr. Fritz's latest publication, the *Preacher's Manual*, will also, in our opinion, make a real contribution to our synodical life.

The *Preacher's Manual* has three main divisions, 1) the manual on preaching, 156 pages; 2) sermon studies, sermons, outlines, pp. 157-369; 3) texts for various occasions and the texts for 7 complete pericopic systems. It is only natural that in the manual of preaching the author had the beginner particularly in mind. But the book is intended also for the experienced pastor. (Preface, p. VIII.) When first reading the manual, we asked ourselves: What can a preacher of twenty and thirty years' experience learn from a manual as concise and brief as the

present one? True, the manual is intended primarily for theological students, and yet the experienced pastor will profit by this manual, not only by "brushing up on the essential things which make for good preaching" but also—and we dare say primarily—by checking his sermon method against the rules laid down in the manual. Yes, we know the basic rules of homiletics. But are we always conscious of them? After preaching one thousand to two thousand sermons, are we not in danger of "getting into a rut"? Use the summary on p. 85, or make your own summary of the basic principles, and then check your sermons according to these rules.

There are several basic principles which the author wishes to impress deeply on his reader. It almost seems that the theme of his book is: The sermon must be textual. We heartily subscribe to this basic principle. We are offended at sermons which treat the text in such a way that the congregation is led to believe that only a well-trained theologian can understand the Scriptures, or sermons which use the text merely as a pretext. We furthermore agree with the author when he writes that the topical method may offer the preacher a wider range but that it invites the preaching of platitudes; the topical sermon may have breadth, but lacks depth. (P. 31.) Lutheran preachers have in the main employed the textual method, and we hope that Dr. Fritz's repeated emphasis of this type of preaching will help to retain this method in our Synod. Of course, as the author points out, the use of this method may cause some difficulty if the preacher uses only the standard pericopes. After all, there is a limit to the number of thoughts which are actually contained in each of the Gospel and Epistle Lessons. If the sermon is to be really textual, then the preacher will turn to other pericopic systems. It is for this reason that the author has included in his book the best-known pericopic systems, supplying the preacher with new texts for fourteen years! (P. 337f.) Textual preaching presupposes thorough textual study. And Dr. Fritz certainly emphasizes the necessity of such study. Another important point which is stressed by the author is the careful preparation of the manuscript. Somewhere we read that former President Coolidge never spoke in public without carefully preparing his manuscript, submitting it to experts for a critical evaluation, and making the necessary corrections. As president he felt the responsibility of being the country's official spokesman too keenly to run the risk of saying something which was not entirely true to facts or which might be subject to misinterpretation. Should not a messenger of the Lord of lords carefully prepare his manuscript? We wonder whether the advice given on p. 75 concerning the careful preparation and the necessary revision of the manuscript is too hard to follow? True, every pastor will in the course of time follow a procedure which is best suited to his natural endowments. But we are inclined to agree with the author that the average preacher should follow these suggestions in the main. Even those preachers who preach from carefully prepared outlines will do well to write sermons at frequent intervals, even though they do not "memorize" the manuscript. Incidentally Dr. Fritz's advice on memorizing is sane and practical. The writing and editing of the

sermon will improve the preacher's style and diction and lead to greater precision in expressing the great truths which are to be presented to the congregation. At the same time it will also help the pastor to avoid another pitfall against which Dr. Walther warns in his *Law and Gospel*: "There is a tendency among young people to value the beautiful language and style of an author more than the contents of his writings. You must always have a greater regard for the matter (*quid*) than the manner (*quomodo*) of a treatise."

We take it that the sermon studies, particularly the completed sermons, furnished by the author, Dr. Th. Laetsch, and Prof. W. A. Baepfer, are not included in the text to relieve the pastor of independent work in preparing his sermons but rather as models and patterns. This opinion would agree with the advice which the author has given in the manual. We hope that these patterns in sermon studies will encourage young preachers to follow the author's earnest advice to make exhaustive textual study the basis for sermon-making. — The chapter on the History of Preaching is not intended to be an exhaustive treatment of this important topic but rather only an introduction to this field. Incidentally, the dates for MacLaren, 1858—1903 (p. 151), are not the dates of this famous preacher's life but of his ministry in Manchester.

Since preaching is the pastor's most important work, conference programs usually include a discussion of some phase of homiletics. May we suggest that chapters of the manual be taken up for discussion? In this way the influence of Dr. Fritz's book will be increased, and under God's gracious guidance the pulpit will fulfill its glorious mission in an ever-increasing measure to the glory of God and the salvation of immortal souls.

F. E. MAYER

Seeking Kenya's Treasures. The Labors of Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Johnston, Africa Inland Mission Pioneers. By Gertrude Hill Nystrom. Zondervan Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 147 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.00.

This is one of the most absorbing biographical sketches of missionaries in Africa which the reviewer has read for years, largely so because the author, a niece of Missionary and Mrs. C. F. Johnston, had access to their voluminous correspondence from which she gleaned the details of her fascinating story. The main interest centers, of course, in the two stations founded by Missionary Johnston, Kangundo and Machakos, both in Ukamba, from which, however, the Gospel spread over large areas. But the story contains many other interesting things. There is, for example, much vivid description of the fauna and flora of the alluring Kenya Colony. Here Theodore Roosevelt hunted wild animals and visited the missionaries personally, receiving from them a new and deeper appreciation of the value of Christian missions. From here also the British and American mission societies took over the Lutheran missions in the present Tanganyika territory after the First World War. This perhaps accounts for the great increase which the Africa Inland Mission showed in the 35 years of Missionary Johnston's service. The chapter on "Twentieth Century Demon Possession" deserves reading by every pastor. The phenomena here described are certainly unique and

agree remarkably with those recorded in the Gospels. Very interesting, too, is the account of the reaction of the natives to communistic influences. After having received innumerable blessings through the preaching of the Gospel for thirty years, the African, in large numbers, including some elders and leaders of the churches, turned against the missionaries because they "had done nothing for them," that is, because they had not given them earthly advantages (a lazy life with nothing to do but with a big salary). What the missionaries did to counteract this insidious, pernicious movement, may teach others, working in Africa or among Negroes in general, valuable lessons. The Africa Inland Mission is a *faith* mission, depending for its needs entirely on faith and prayer. How well this prayer plan worked in the cases of Mr. and Mrs. Johnston puts to shame all who are listless and indifferent to prayer. Since the biography is written from the Moody-school background, a number of things in the book differ from Lutheran teaching and practice. These, however, may easily be explained by the pastor to such groups as desire to read the book. And it certainly should be read, since for stimulating missionary interest it occupies first rank among mission books of its kind.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

The Deacon and Worship. By Amos John Traver. Published by The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. 64 pages, 5x7. Price, 20 cents.

In this brochure of 64 pages only one phase of the duties of the deacons and church councilmen is taken up, their duty with respect to public worship. The author speaks of the nature of worship, the Common Service, some liturgical customs, Christian symbols, music in the public service, of receiving the sermon, of Holy Communion, and other responsibilities of the church councilmen. While, of course, the booklet is written for the United Lutheran Church in America, yet it contains much valuable information on the points mentioned, and many church officers will be benefited by a perusal of it. The Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence is not correctly brought out on page 50, where we read, "Lutherans believe that the spiritual body and blood of Christ are present in the Communion, for He said, 'This is My body' and 'This is the blood of the New Testament.' They also believe that there is no actual change in the bread and wine. Some of the Lutheran theologians have tried to find words to explain this mystery by saying that Christ's body and blood were present 'in, with, and under the bread and wine.' After all is said, it still remains a great mystery, only to be accepted by faith. To Lutherans it is always something more than a feast of memory. It is a sacrament in every sense of the word. The very life of Christ enters the soul of the sincere communicant, to drive out sin and renew and empower him for Christian living." Whether six Communion services each year are sufficient "so that the souls of Christian people are properly nourished" (p. 47), we doubt very much. And we hope that the custom of securing "signed cards from all who commune" will in our circles never replace the age-old custom of personal registration for Holy Communion.

TH. LAETSCH